00142002

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY-400 023.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 26 March, 2016

THE

FALL OF NINEVEH

AND

THE REIGN OF SENNACHERIB,

CHRONOLOGICALLY CONSIDERED,

WITH A VIEW TO THE

READJUSTMENT OF SACRED AND PROFANE CHRONOLOGY.

14002
a v

BY

J. W. BOSANQUET, Esq.

"We stand upon the very threshold of a new æra in the history of antiquity. In Nineveh, Babylonia, and Persia, centuries long past will come to light again, and the ancient times will present themselves clearly and distinctly in all their details."

NIEBUHR'S "*Lectures on Ancient History*," Vol. i, p. 63.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS.

1853.

935
BOS/Fal
142002

PREFACE.

THE following pages have been written during a period of deep affliction. Would that their contents might prove as acceptable to the reader, as the writing of them has been consolatory to the author. In pursuing my investigation of the grounds upon which the current Scripture Chronology is founded, I am conscious of having treated freely—I trust not too freely—the opinions of writers better informed than myself in several branches of knowledge upon which I have been compelled to touch. Let not this be set down to presumption or want of reverence for the opinions of others, but rather to sincere faith in the strength of the cause which I support. The question to be considered is in fact a question of credibility between sacred and profane history—between classical and scriptural authority—between the records, often contradictory, of the wise and accomplished of the heathens during their period of literary pre-eminence, but of moral darkness and corruption: and the records—consistent as they appear to me—of the wisest and the holiest of God's holy people, written during their period of exaltation over the nations of the earth, as the express guardians of the word of truth, recorded in The Book

held forth to the world as the lamp of light and life. These two sources of information are at variance with each other: and I have no hesitation in expressing my conviction that profane history, or at least our method of interpreting profane history, is at fault.

From those, then, whose delight and whose habit it is to search the Scriptures daily whether those things be so, I look for a patient, and I trust indulgent consideration, while I lay before them a system of sacred chronology which appears to me to be less open to objection than that which is generally entertained. The importance of the subject may not, perhaps, be apparent at first sight, but to the religious inquirer its importance cannot be overstated. If I am wrong in my arrangement, my time will not be mis-spent in drawing attention to several difficulties in the received system which require to be removed. If I am right—I dare not indulge my fancy in describing the bright vista of results which either directly or remotely must flow from the discovery. Suffice it to say, that if I have succeeded in shewing that, after a more correct adjustment of Scripture Chronology, no real difficulty remains in the way of a simple explanation of Daniel's great prophecy of the "Seventy Weeks," a breach—a wide and important breach—will have been made in the barrier which has so long separated Jewish and Christian brethren. The time is now at hand when prejudice must and will

yield before the truth. If the Jew is right in his belief, that the Messiah has not yet appeared upon earth, let all become the followers of Moses. But if Christianity be the truth, and if it can be clearly shewn that the Messiah was manifested at the appointed time foretold by his prophet, no prejudice should stand in the way of the sincere and earnest Hebrew inquirer in embracing the truth. May it be my lot to be permitted to perform even a subordinate part in removing obstacles now in the way of that long-looked-for and glorious consummation, when the children of Israel shall be reconciled to their God; and in hastening the time when "they shall no more say, the Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but the Lord liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the North country, and from all countries whither I had driven them, and they shall dwell in their own land."

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

The discoveries in Egypt and Assyria shed new light daily on the history of the chosen people. These discoveries most opportune in these days of scepticism.

The books of Daniel and Ezra beset with historical difficulties. For instance,—

1st. Daniel and Berosus both knew the true titles of the kings of Babylon. When Daniel therefore speaks of Darius he cannot, as we are told, mean Cyaxares, nor speak of a time when no Darius reigned in Babylon according to Berosus.

2nd. Ezra was contemporary with the Persian kings he speaks of. When therefore he speaks of Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes, he cannot mean Cambyses and Smerdis, as we find in the current Scripture chronology.

3rd. Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah, who dedicated the wall of Jerusalem and lived to B.C. 433, is in the [redacted] nology made to have returned to [redacted] more than 100 years before.

4th. The eclipse of Thales was in B.C. 585, before the fall of Nineveh,—yet in the current chronology Jerusalem is destroyed in B.C. 588, before the fall of Nineveh.

5th. According to the received Scripture chronology, Daniel's prophecy of the 70 weeks is confessedly inexplicable, yet Daniel is a faithful historian as well as prophet.

The works of Berosus, Manetho, Eratosthenes, and Menander lost during the Roman occupation of Asia.

Our Scripture chronology derived from Africanus, Syncellus, and Eusebius.

Scaliger has removed some of their errors.

Sir Isaac Newton was anxious to remove more.

Niebuhr, with new and important historical information, has failed to elucidate the historical difficulties in Scripture, owing to want of sufficient reverence for the sacred writings.

Important synchronism discovered by Colonel Rawlinson from the Assyrian inscriptions, viz., that the 14th year of Hezekiah was the 3rd year of Sennacherib.

Chronological errors of the author in a former work.

Discovery of the Author, that the 4th year of Darius in Scripture signifies the 4th year of Darius son of Hystaspes, as king over the realm of the Chaldeans, counted from the time when he took that kingdom, that is, when about 62 years old.

The true date of the eclipse of Thales discovered only very recently.

Data upon which the following treatise is founded—

1st. That the 3rd of Sennacherib was the 14th of Hezekiah and last of Ilulæus.

2nd. That the eclipse of Thales was on 28th May, B.C. 585.

3rd. That the eclipse preceded the fall of Nineveh, and therefore the 1st of Nebuchadnezzar.

4th. That Darius, son of Hystaspes, was about 62 years old in B.C. 493.

CHAPTER II.

Dr. Hales deduces the date of the eclipse of Thales, which he places in B.C. 603, from the date of the destruction of Nineveh, which he places in B.C. 606.

The Author proposes to deduce the date of the fall of Nineveh from the date of the eclipse.

Mr. Hind and Mr. Airy consider the date of the eclipse to be fixed to the year B.C. 585, beyond the possibility of a doubt.

Cyaxares, in whose reign the eclipse happened, began to reign the year after the death of Phraortes, his father.

Phraortes, or Arphaxad, was slain in the 12th year of Nebuchodonosor, who reigned at Nineveh.

Nabopalassar reigned at Nineveh, and was Nebuchodonosor.

The 12th year of Nabopalassar astronomically fixed to B.C. 614.

Cyaxares therefore began to reign in B.C. 613, and died in B.C. 574, not in B.C. 595.
Nabopalassar was the king called in history Sardanapalus.
His last year in Nineveh was B.C. 606.
He was then conquered by Cyaxares.
The Scythians conquered Cyaxares in the same year.
The Scythians ruled over Asia for 28 years, from B.C. 606 to B.C. 579.
Final destruction of Nineveh B.C. 579.
First year of Nebuchadnezzar B.C. 578.
Astyages probably made satrap of Media during the life of his father Cyaxares, at the time of his attack on Nineveh.
Diodorus and Ctesias in error in supposing Sardanapalus to have been the last king of Nineveh. Saracus was the last king.
The Canon of Ptolemy in error in placing the first year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar in B.C. 604. The date of this reign must necessarily be regulated by, and come after, the date of the eclipse of Thales.
A futile attempt made to disprove the date of the eclipse, from its supposed inconsistency with the reign of Cyrus, as placed by Herodotus.
Herodotus himself tells us that he was quite uncertain about the true history of Cyrus, of whom there were three other accounts besides that adopted by him.

CHAPTER III.

In the learned age of the successors of Alexander in Asia, the history and chronology of the several nations of Asia were well understood.
Assyrian, Babylonian, Jewish, and Egyptian records of the age, confirm with accuracy the chronology deduced from the eclipse of Thales and Herodotus.
The 4th year of Jehoiakim we know was the 1st year of Nebuchadnezzar. If therefore the 1st year of Nebuchadnezzar is rightly placed in the previous chapter in B.C. 578, the 14th of Hezekiah, or, which is the same thing, the 3rd of Sennacherib, should be found to be the year B.C. 689-8.

The chronology of the several nations above-mentioned concurs in placing the 3rd of Sennacherib about B.C. 689—8.

1. Polyhistor, in quoting Berosus, distinctly places the 3rd of Sennacherib about B.C. 689—8.
2. Demetrius, the Jewish historian, places the invasion of Judæa by Sennacherib in Feb. 688.
3. The canon of Ptolemy, in fixing the death of Asaradinus or Esarhaddon in the year B.C. 668—7, brings the 3rd of Sennacherib to B.C. 688—9.
4. The Tyrian annals place the 4th year of Solomon in B.C. 989. The 14th of Hezekiah or 3rd of Sennacherib was exactly 300 years after that date, that is B.C. 689—8. Niebuhr places the reign of Solomon lower. But he bases his calculation upon the date of the foundation of Carthage, instead of the date of the flight of Dido from Tyre.
5. The same Tyrian annals give 36 years to the reign of Ilulæus. Ilulæus was conquered by Sennacherib in his 3rd year, which if placed in B.C. 689 is the 37th year after the Ilulæus of the Canon of Ptolemy began to reign.
6. Abydenus coincides with these deductions.

The harmony between these several authorities, thus interpreted, very striking, when compared with the confusion drawn from them by Mr. Clinton.

7. Manetho's chronology considered.

Did not place the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses in B.C. 525.

Manetho followed Ctesias in Persian matters.

So does the Parian Chronicle.

Syncellus and Eusebius quote Manetho to that effect.

That Ctesias was correct we may draw from a fact mentioned by Herodotus, viz., that Darius Hystaspes was about 20 years of age when Cambyses began to reign.

Three years of the reign of Cambyses were concurrent with the reign of Darius Hystaspes. This appears to be confirmed by the inscription at Behistun.

Cambyses reigned 15 years over Persia and 3 over Egypt. Conquered Egypt in B.C. 520.

Tarcos or Tirhakah, therefore, began to reign in B.C. 688—7 the year after Sennacherib invaded Judæa. The length of the 26th dynasty of Manetho discussed.

The sum of the reigns 150, not 160 years.
The reigns of Amosis and Apries overlap 10 years.
8th. Median chronology places the revolt of Deioces in the year B.C. 689—8.
Josephus places the revolt above the 14th of Hezekiah.
9th. Lydian chronology coincides.
Mr. Johannes Von Gumpach arrives at the same conclusions with regard to the reign of Sennacherib, though he falls into error, having followed Oltmann's date for the eclipse of Thales.
Mr. Johannes Brandis equally at fault from the same cause.

—

CHAPTER IV.

The discoveries of Mr. Layard. Probable existence of astronomical records, which may afford the means of fixing dates.
The record of the third year of Sennacherib sufficient alone for the purpose of fixing Assyrian chronology.
Dr. Hincks and Colonel Rawlinson support the received chronology out of the Assyrian inscriptions.
Marduc-bal-adan of the inscriptions supposed to be Mardocempadus of the Canon of Ptolemy.
This is probably a correct conclusion; but the inference that Marduc-bal-adan, son of Yagin, is the Merodach-Baladan, son of Baladan, of Scripture, does not follow.
Objections to Dr. Hincks arrangement.
1st. He places the 14th of Hezekiah before the taking of Ashdod by Sargon. Isaiah places it after.
2nd. The 14th of Hezekiah does not fall in a Sabbatical year, as it ought.
3rd. The "son of Yagin" could not be the prince described in Scripture as the "son of Baladan."
4th. The 14th of Hezekiah falls in the reign of Sargon. Scripture places it in the reign of Sennacherib. Sennacherib's invasion falls in the 25th year of Hezekiah. Scripture places it about the 14th.
5th. Sargon is supposed to be the destroyer of Samaria. Scripture seems to imply that it was Shalmanezer.

Dr. Hincks discovery of the identity of Mardocempalus of the Canon with the son of Yagin of the inscriptions is a fatal blow to the received chronology.
The Author proposes a scheme which is more in harmony with Scripture.
Pekah reigned more than 20 years.
Fresh discoveries of Colonel Rawlinson.

CHAPTER V.

Recapitulation of dates determined from profane records in the foregoing chapters.
It is proposed in this chapter to shew that the same dates may be deduced from Scripture independently of all heathen authority.
The authority of the Hebrew writers not a whit inferior to the authority of Greek writers, but rather to be preferred.
The Hebrew Scriptures contain a system of chronology for 1000 years B.C. more perfect than can be drawn from the records of any heathen nation.
The septennial division of time into Sabbatical years and Jubilees the foundation of the system.
The period of non-observance of the Sabbatical years recorded against Judah and Israel, from whence we obtain the series of appointed years.
Hebrew chronology contains a two-fold period of seventy Sabbatical weeks, making a period of 980 years from the dedication of Solomon's temple to the birth of Christ.
Short explanation of the law relating to the Sabbatical years and Jubilees.
The continuous series of Sabbatical years not broken by the captivity at Babylon.
Table of the period of the First Temple, comprising 70 weeks from the dedication by Solomon to the first year of Darius the Median.
Table of the period of the Second Temple, comprising 70 weeks, from the first year of Darius to the birth of Christ, and of

69 weeks from the dedication of the temple to the same point.

The point at which these two periods of 70 weeks meet is the year B.B. 493, in which year Darius the son of Hystaspes was about "three score and two years old," when it is said that he "took the kingdom," or the first year in which he was "made king over the realm of the Chaldeans,"

This scheme compared with the common arrangement, and with that proposed by Scaliger.

Observations on the years of Jubilee.

One indubitable reference to the year of Jubilee at the time of the invasion of Sennacherib.

The second year of the reign of Darius, according to Jewish tradition, a year of Jubilee.

Reference to the year of Jubilee in Ezekiel.

One Jubilee referred to under the Second Temple.

The "seven weeks" of Daniel the period of the Jubilee terminated by the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem by Nehemiah.

The consecration of walled cities one of the acts performed during the year of Jubilee.

As some are disposed to consider the Sabbatical years uncertain, and useless in fixing Hebrew chronology, the same dates which have been determined from profane history are deduced from Scripture by taking the period of seventy weeks merely as 490 years.

CHAPTER VI.

Some difficulties in the proposed arrangement pointed out.

Ahasuerus is undoubtedly Xerxes.

How, then, is Darius son of Hystaspes called by Daniel, Darius son of Ahasuerus?

The original Septuagint translation of Daniel contains different readings from the present Hebrew.

Chaldee and Hebrew passages compared.

Ahasuerus of the Hebrew, and Artaxerxes of the translations both signify Xerxes.

Xerxes placed on the throne of Persiâ by Darius son of Hystaspes when at the age of 62, he took in hand the government of the Chaldeans.

Many reasons for concluding that Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes in Scripture signify Xerxes.

Daniel probably wrote Darius *and* Ahasuerus: not Darius son of Ahasuerus.

We infer from Herodotus that Xerxes was associated with Darius before his death.

Probably in the year B.C. 493.

A passage in Thucydides favours this idea.

Ahasuerus or Xerxes forbids the building of the temple. Darius, as supreme sovereign, reverses his decree.

The temple is finished, Darius and Xerxes being both kings of Persia.

Passage in the XI. Chapter of Daniel explained.

The exact position of Cyrus and Belshazzar requires further consideration.

The lowering of the reign of Cyrus obviates a difficulty in the exposition of the book of Daniel, where he is supposed to speak of tutelary angels presiding over the kingdoms of Greece and Persia.

The defence of the book of Daniel the appointed duty of the Jews.

Jews and Christians both waiting for the same Messiah.

Jewish article of belief. The same as believed by the prophet Jonah.

Time when the kingdoms of this world shall "become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Messiah" close at hand.

ERRATA.

Page 15, line 6, read "other,' instead of "one."
„ 17, „ 8, „ "of," „ "at."
„ 35, „ 10, „ "691—90," „ "991—90."
„ 80, „ 22, „ "70," „ "7."
„ 94, „ 4, „ "have." „ "here."
„ 97, „ 1, dele "of,"
„ 104, „ 19, read "ב," instead of "כ."
„ 17, Appendix, line 20, read "=604, 3m," instead of "6=04, 3m."

Chronological Table, last page but two, 5th column, read "B.C. 192," instead of "B.C. 592."

THE FALL OF NINEVEH.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

It has pleased the Almighty in these latter days to reveal to us historical truths, which have been hidden for more than two thousand years—to guide us to the tombs of those ancient kings of Egypt, under whom the Israelites passed their weary sojourn of four hundred years—and to lay open the palaces of the kings of Assyria, who in after times led captive their tribes, and scattered them through the cities of the Medes and other parts of their dominions. In the halls of Sargon and Sennacherib are found, engraved as it were by the hand of yesterday, the annals and exploits of those kings, and they tell us of events and persons recorded in the pages of sacred Scripture. The names of Jehu, Hazael, and Benhadad, of Menahem, Rezin, and Hezekiah, have already been deciphered from the monuments of ancient Nineveh; and much light may be expected daily to be thrown upon the early history and chronology of the chosen people, by the researches of archæologists amongst both Egyptian* and Assyrian monuments.

* The researches of Mr. Reginald Poole in Egyptology have for me a peculiar interest. His "Horæ Ægyptiacæ" is full of curious matter, though not sufficiently digested.

This new insight into antiquity has been granted to us at a time when it was indeed much needed. For, in these days of accurate criticism, when nothing can escape the acuteness of the sceptic, many of the books of Scripture have been subject to doubts and objections, owing to historical difficulties involved in the mode of adjusting their position in antiquity. Book after book has been declared either spurious or legendary; and no one can deny the validity of some of the historical objections which have been raised against them.

The Books of Daniel and Ezra are especially open to this sort of attack; and though no one need be alarmed concerning the truth of what is related in them, many are disposed to neglect the study of them, as at present incapable of being reconciled with other authentic history.

I will give a few instances, out of many, of the difficulties involved in our present mode of explaining the history and chronology of sacred Scripture.

I. We learn from the prophet Daniel himself, that he conversed face to face with the several kings who ruled in his days over the province of Babylon. No one could have a better knowledge than Daniel of the true titles by which those kings were designated in Babylon. We have, also, from the pen of a Babylonian priest, of the age of Alexander the Great, a list, which has never yet been disputed, of the several Chaldean and Persian sovereigns who ruled in Babylon. When, therefore, we are told by the expositors of Scripture, that in speaking of Darius the Median,* who "took the kingdom" (*i. e.*, of

* Daniel v. 31.

Babylon), "being about three score and two years old," and of his being "set over the realm of the Chaldæans,"* Daniel refers to a time when no king bearing the title Darius can be found in the Babylonian record, or in any ancient history; and when, moreover, we are asked to believe that this mighty monarch, who ruled over one hundred and twenty provinces, is an insignificant prince not known to Herodotus, and called Cyaxares by the historian Xenophon, there is reasonable ground for hesitation, in yielding assent to this conclusion, in the mind of every candid inquirer.

II. Ezra was contemporary, or nearly so, with the several kings of Persia mentioned in his writings, and was well acquainted with their true titles. Yet we are called upon to believe, that he has designated the prince, whose true title, according to existing monuments, was Cambyses,† by the title Ahasuerus; and Smerdis, or Bardes, as he is described in the inscription at Behistun, by the title Artaxerxes. Thus giving a loose and unsatisfactory character to the writings of Ezra, which, as coming from the pen of a contemporaneous historian, should be found, as I believe they will be found, full of the most minute and accurate information.

III. Sir Isaac Newton long ago pointed out that Nehemiah, the son of Hachaliah, the Tirshatha (Nehem. I. i–x. i–viii. 9.), who was living in, and after, the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C. 433, was the same Nehemiah, son of Hachaliah, the Tirshatha, who sealed

* Dan. ix. 1.

† Kambuziya in Babylonian.
Kamboth in Hieroglyphick.
Kabujiya in Persian.
Cambyses in Greek.

the covenant with the priests who came up from Babylon with Zerubbabel, and also (vii. 7 and 65) came up to Jerusalem from Babylon in the reign of Cyrus, as is usually supposed in B.C. 536; so that, if he was of sufficient age to have been a leader of the Jews in the time of Cyrus, he must have been in all the vigour of life as their ruler, at about one hundred and thirty years of age, when he dedicated the wall of Jerusalem and marched round its ramparts,* according to the current chronology.

IV. We know, from the concurrent testimony of history and astronomy, that a certain eclipse, foretold by the philosopher Thales, occurred in the year B.C. 585; and we are told that the destruction of Nineveh took place after that eclipse. Yet, in our common Scripture chronology, we find the fall of Jerusalem placed in the year B.C. 588, before the fall of Nineveh, which can only be conceivable, by setting at nought the testimony of the most ancient historians.

V. It is painful to find, that the most remarkable, most interesting, and most precise of all Daniel's prophecies, viz., that which foretold the time of the coming of the Messiah upon earth, and which, having been fulfilled, should afford the most decisive and indisputable proof of the inspiration of his writings, is sometimes avoided altogether by expositors as irreconcileable with chronology, and always so lightly touched upon, that it is but too evident how dissatisfied the writers are with the weakness and tenderness of their own conclusions. No one can candidly affirm, that this great prophecy has yet been satisfactorily explained.

* Nehem. xii. 38.

Nevertheless, I am persuaded that true history, as well as prophecy, has been conveyed to us in that sacred book; —that Daniel has there described events in Persian and Babylonish history, known to him far more accurately than to any heathen historian writing of the same times; —and that those will yet be convicted of error, who have ventured, on heathen authority, to deny the authenticity of that holy book. It is this Daniel who saw in vision, and has pictured to our minds, the broad outline of the history of the world from his own time forward, in the succession of the four great heathen monarchies, far more distinctly than any historian heathen or Christian, even after the events, has been able to describe it, except by borrowing his imagery: and I have no hesitation in asserting, and it is my object here to shew, that the true chain of eastern chronology, for ten centuries at least before the Christian era, is more clearly deducible from this, and the other historical books of Scripture, than from the writings of any other nation which have come down to us.

How the correct record of the history and chronology of the East, which certainly existed in the times of the Macedonian monarchs in Asia, has perished, it is difficult to account for. A flood of darkness seems to have followed in the train of their subsequent Roman conquerors. In it have disappeared the works of Berosus, Manetho, Eratosthenes, and Menander, and the Christian world has been left with such guides as Africanus, Syncellus, and Eusebius, careless investigators to say the least (some call Eusebius dishonest), to lead us through the obscurity.

Joseph Scaliger and his contemporaries, in the sixteenth century, did much indeed to remove the confusion introduced by these early Christian chronographers. Towards the end of the seventeenth century, Sir Isaac Newton laboured in the same field. And I am persuaded, from his remarks on the books of Ezra and Nehemiah—from his having pointed out the sixty-two sabbatical weeks of Daniel, in the 434 years between the 28th year of Artaxerxes Longimanus and the birth of Christ,* the first link in the chain of scripture chronology—from his recognition of the period of the Jubilee,† in the seven weeks of Daniel—from his deep reverence for the holy Scriptures—and from the chronological difficulties in which he found himself involved, in adapting the historical date of the eclipse of Thales to the current chronology of Scripture—that he was desirous of finding some mode of shortening the period, between the reign of Cyrus and the birth of Christ, and that he was in search of, if indeed he had not caught a glimpse of, the light which is now breaking in upon us. It is only a proof of the absence of sufficient chronological data in his days, that he continued to uphold the received chronology, and solved his difficulties in Median history, on the arbitrary assumption that Herodotus had, in error, reversed the order of the reigns of the two kings of Media, Astyages and Cyaxares.

Niebuhr, the great authority in modern days on the subject of history and chronology, had the additiona light of several valuable passages from Polyhistor and Abydenus, discovered in the Armenian version of Euse-

* "Observations on Daniel," &c. p. 135. † *Ibid.* p. 133.

bius, and bearing upon Assyrian and Babylonian chronology. These he had studied, and seems, in consequence, to have wavered in his opinion with regard to the length of the important reign of Nabopalassar, king of Babylon, in whose reign, as I have already pointed out,* there is an error involved in the received chronology. In a remarkable passage also, in his lectures on ancient history, he has even overshot the mark, in lowering in the most decisive tone, the date of the reigns of Solomon and Rehoboam,† a conclusion which involves the whole question I am about to consider. For, if the date of the reign of Solomon is lowered, the dates also of the reign of Josiah, and the fall of Nineveh, and also of the fall of Jerusalem, must be lowered to the same extent.

Niebuhr's insight into history, where it pleased him to investigate, is truly wonderful, and his conclusions must ever be received with the greatest respect. He was, however, deficient in reverence for the holy Scriptures, at least till late in life, and has not cared to cultivate that noble field of ancient history. He had no faith in the superintending providence which guided the composition and preservation of the holy volume, and the record of Scripture therefore ranked lower in his estimation than the record of classical writers. He has even dared to impugn the authority of one at least of the books of the sacred canon. His views of history and chronology are altogether taken from a pagan point of view. He might almost have been born before the Christian era. Niebuhr, therefore, has failed to perceive the light thrown upon sacred history, by the passages above referred to.

* "Athenæum," 25th Oct., 1851. † "Lectures on Ant. Hist.," v. iii. p. 159

He felt strongly the importance of the eclipse of Thales, as a chronological beacon by which to guide us through the intricate period of the Median empire, and appears to have taken much pains to ascertain the date. He ended, however, by concluding, that tradition had erroneously placed the war between Cyaxares and Alyattes in the time of the eclipse, because it would not square with his chronology. Won also by the sweet eloquence of Herodotus, he has virtually accepted his version of the events and chronology of the time of Cyrus, protesting at the same time that he knew not whether to follow Herodotus or Ctesias; though Ctesias and Xenophon, the latter of whom he repudiates as an historian, have expressly pointed out the errors of Herodotus, and afford the means of framing a history of those times more consistent with the book of Daniel.

Within the last year, a most important addition to our knowledge of Assyrian history has been made by Colonel Rawlinson, who has deciphered the annals of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, from the marbles of Nineveh. In one short passage of these annals, is contained a synchronism of the greatest value in determining the date of that reign. By means of this passage, coupled with what Herodotus says of Sennacherib and Sethos, we are enabled to connect together definite points of Assyrian, Judæan, Tyrian, and Egyptian history, in one particular year, the date of which we shall be able to establish with perfect clearness. The passage referred to, synchronizes the third year of Sennacherib in Nineveh, the fourteenth of Hezekiah in Jerusalem, the last of Ilulæus in Sydon.

Let me now say a few words upon certain chronological errors into which I myself have fallen, in my work published in 1846, on the "Times of Daniel, &c.," and explain why it is that some of the dates now proposed differ to the extent of five years from those previously entertained.

In my former work, I pointed out the importance of a passage from Demetrius, a learned Jew probably of Alexandria, contemporary with Eratosthenes, and living therefore in an age when chronology was studied and understood. Demetrius had written a history of the kings of Judæa, and having fixed the fundamental date of his reckoning in the first year of Ptolemy Philopator, I had conceived that he calculated from the first year of Philopator as king of Judæa, where he did not begin to reign till five years after his accession to the throne of Egypt. I did not then perceive correctly the exact agreement between Demetrius, Polyhistor, and the canon of Ptolemy. It is clear, however, that these three authorities adopted the same chronology; and by counting the dates of Demetrius from the first year of Philopator in Egypt, all three are found to coincide. By this alteration, the date of the fall of Jerusalem, as recorded by Demetrius, becomes Aug. B.C. 560, not B.C. 555, as I had before supposed.

The correction of this error, led to the important discovery of the true termination of the seventy years of the desolation of Jerusalem in B.C. 490 = fourth year of Darius, according to the prophet Zechariah; and from thence to the date of the first Scriptural year of Darius, B.C. 493; for we are told that Darius was about "three

score and two years old" when "he took the kingdom;" that is, of the Chaldæans; and this was the age of Darius Hystaspes in the year B.C. 493, as explained by me in the "Athenæum" of Sept. 4th, 1852.*

Thus the common delusion into which, with all others, I had fallen, that Cyaxares, king of Media, was Darius the Mede of Daniel, was dispelled. My idea, that the Darius of Ezra was Xerxes, equally fell to the ground; as also the idea that Darius, the son of Hystaspes, was the Ahasuerus of Scripture. I still adhere, however, to the opinion, that two princes of the name of Cyrus are spoken of in history; one by Ctesias, as the son-in-law and contemporary of Astyages, who conquered Astyages and Crœsus; the other by Xenophon, as the grandson of Astyages, who conquered Babylon, and who is the Cyrus spoken of in Scripture.

Since the year 1846 I have been at much pains in procuring a recalculation of the date of the eclipse of Thales. Having pointed out the entire want of foundation for the idea, that the battle between the Lydians and Medes, during which the eclipse occurred, was fought near the river Halys, and having succeeded in shewing from Mr. Baily's observations, contrary to his own decision, that the eclipse of B.C. 610, fixed upon by Oltmann and himself, and adopted by Ideler and all recent chronologists as that of Thales, must have fallen too far north to have been total anywhere in Asia Minor: I suggested that the course of the tyrant Agathocles from Syracuse to Africa in August B.C. 310, when he was benighted by a

* See Appendix.

total eclipse, must have been to the north, not to the south of Sicily; and roughly pointed out from Mr. Baily's observations, without pretending, however, to the accuracy of an astronomer, how such an alteration of the Moon's latitude in B.C. 310, would bring the Moon's shadow in the year B.C. 585 over Ionia and Cilicia, as foretold by Thales. All this is stated in a letter to the "Athenæum," which appeared on the 7th of Aug. 1852.* And in that journal, under date 28th of Aug., I had the pleasure to see Mr. Hind's calculation, laying down, with astronomical precision, almost the identical line of shadow I had pointed out, and proving beyond dispute that the eclipse of B.C. 585 was that of Thales.†

The conclusions arrived at in the ensuing pages are based, therefore, upon the following chronological data; which, if not disputed, must inevitably lead to the lowering of the whole chain of Scripture chronology to the extent of twenty-eight years.

1st. That the third year of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, was the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, king of Judah, and the last year of Ilulæus, king of Sidon and Tyre.

2nd. That the true date of the eclipse of Thales is 28th of May, B.C. 585.

3rd. That this eclipse preceded the fall of Nineveh,

* *See* Appendix.

† I must not omit to mention the assistance I have received from Mr. Drew Snooke of the Isle of Wight, who, as early as April 1852, pointed out to me the probable path of the eclipse of B.C. 310, from his own tables for calculating eclipses, since published, and which has since proved to be nearly correct, according to the calculations of the Astronomer Royal.

and, therefore, also preceded the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon = fourth year of Jehoiakim, king of Judah.

4th. That Darius the son of Hystaspes was "about three score and two years old," in the year B.C. 493.

CHAPTER II.

THE FALL OF NINEVEH.

"THE destruction of Nineveh," writes Dr. Hales, "B.C. 606, forms a fundamental date in Profane Chronology, both upwards and downwards, upon which depends the adjustment of the antecedent periods of Assyrian and Babylonian chronology, and also of the subsequent periods of Babylonian, Median, and Persian chronology, and by its connexion with the eclipse of Thales, determined chiefly from thence to B.C. 603, of Lydian and Grecian chronology also."*

Dr. Hales, it will be observed, here deduces the date of the eclipse of Thales from the date of the fall of Nineveh; and the connexion between the two events is indeed unquestionable. But, since his supposed date of the eclipse is proved to be erroneous, the presumption is, that the date assumed for the fall of Nineveh is erroneous also; and that this fundamental date, from which the chronology of Assyria, Babylonia, Media, Persia, and Lydia is computed, is together with its superstructure resting upon no solid foundation.

I propose to take what appears to me a more satisfactory course, and to deduce the true date of the destruction of Nineveh from the now ascertained date of the

* Hales' "Chronology," vol. iv. p. 54, note.

eclipse of Thales. This course, indeed, could not have been pursued with certainty when Dr. Hales wrote, owing to the imperfection of the astronomical tables for calculating eclipses of ancient date. Recent improvements in the tables, however, and especially those introduced by Mr. Airy, from a reduction of the lunar observations made at the Greenwich Observatory, have rendered these calculations capable of being made, with a degree of accuracy which leaves but little further to be required.

Mr. Hind, than whose authority on these points none is greater, was the first who from the improved tables, coupled with certain data of his own, computed the path of the great eclipse of May B.C. 585, which history declares to be the eclipse predicted by Thales to the Ionians. He writes, "the central line of shadow would pass a few miles north of Miletus, the reputed birthplace of Thales, and terminate in the sea, to the north of the island of Cyprus. The eclipse would be total in Ionia, Lydia, Pamphylia, and the southern part of Cilicia. All this agrees so well with historical indications, that I conceive we are justified in fixing upon the eclipse of B.C. 585, May 28, as that of Thales and Herodotus. No probable correction of the elements of the Moon's orbit is likely to effect this conclusion." *

Mr. Airy, the Astronomer Royal, soon after came to the same conclusion, by a calculation turning chiefly on the idea that the course taken by Agathocles, when passing from Syracuse to Africa, during the eclipse of August B.C. 310, was north and not south of Sicily, as usually supposed; a suggestion which occurred to me, on comparing

* "Athenæum Journal," Aug. 28, 1852.

the accounts of that voyage in Diodorus and Justin, and which I had the honour of communicating to him, together with several arguments in favour of the northern route. He has also computed the paths of the several eclipses visible in Asia Minor during the fifty years previous to B.C. 580, and finds that no one was total in Asia Minor between that year and B.C. 630. He concluded a lecture, at the Royal Institution, on the 4th of February, 1853, with the opinion, "that the date B.C. 585 was now established for the eclipse of Thales beyond the possibility of a doubt." We already know that all ancient authority places the event at or near the same date. Both history and astronomy, therefore, coincide in placing the date of the eclipse of Thales in the year B.C. 585.

Now, my object being to ascertain the date of the fall of Nineveh by means of this eclipse, I shall endeavour to do so.

1st. By shewing, that the reign of Cyaxares, king of Media, who destroyed Nineveh, and in whose reign the eclipse happened, must necessarily be lowered at least twenty-one years below the current date, and that he began to reign in the year B.C. 613.

2nd. By identifying Nabopalassar, king of Babylon, whose reign is astronomically fixed, with Sardanapalus the last Assyrian king of Nineveh, who must have fallen in B.C. 606.

And after having fixed the dates of the reigns of the destroyer of Nineveh, and of the last king of the Assyrian dynasty in that city, by following the simple narrative of Herodotus, we shall arrive without difficulty at the date of the final catastrophe in which that city was destroyed.

First, then, with regard to Cyaxares, we know that the eclipse happened during his reign (Herod. l. i. 74). We know also that he reigned forty years (l. i. 106). If, therefore, we include the eclipse of B.C. 585 in his reign, he could not have come to the throne earlier than B.C. 624.

That he came to the throne somewhat later than B.C. 624, we may infer from Herodotus, since he gives us no reason to suppose that Cyaxares died in the year of the eclipse. But we learn the exact date of his accession to have been B.C. 613, by comparing Herodotus with the book of Judith. This ancient Chaldee book has been repudiated by many learned men, chiefly from its inconsistency with the received chronology. There is scarcely any other reason for rejecting it. But this, in my opinion, is a point greatly in favour of its veracity. The chronological data contained in this book, which are very precise, and not at all of the character of fiction, could not be true, had they agreed with the common chronology. From this book, then, which I believe to contain true history, we collect, that a king of Media, called in the Chaldee Arphaxad, was slain by Nabuchodonosor, "who reigned in Nineveh." (Judith i. 1.)

Now, whether we receive the book of Judith as true history, or merely as romance founded upon history, this Arphaxad could be no other than the Phraortes of Herodotus, who was the immediate predecessor of Cyaxares. For Phraortes, he tells us, was slain in war against the king of Nineveh (Herod. l. i. 102), and we know of no other king of Media who was so slain. The book of Judith (I follow St. Jerome and Prideaux)* places the

* Prideaux's "Connexions," vol. i. p. 51.

death of Arphaxad or Phraortes in the twelfth year of the reign of the Assyrian king; Cyaxares, therefore, the successor of Phraortes, counted his reign from the following year, that is, from the thirteenth year of Nabuchodonosor, king of Nineveh.

Who then was this "Nebuchodonosor, who reigned at Nineveh?" that we may learn the date of his thirteenth year.

We learn from the Canon at Ptolemy, that Nabopalassar, king of Babylon, began to reign in the year B.C. 625, and we have ascertained by means of the eclipse that Phraortes was slain not earlier than B.C. 624, during the reign therefore of Nabopalassar.. Now Nabopalassar was also king of Nineveh, and therefore Nebuchodonosor who slew Phraortes. For, Polyhistor has preserved a list of the later kings of Nineveh, in one of the newly-discovered passages of that author, contained in the Armenian version of Eusebius, which runs thus:—

Sinecherim reigned	18	years.	(Sennacherib)
His son .	„ 8	„	(Esarhaddon)
Sammughes	„ 21	„	
His brother	„ 21	„	
Nabupalsar .	„ 20	„	

Nabupalsar is here clearly the same as Nabopalassar, who was therefore not only king of Babylon, but also reigned at Nineveh. Polyhistor means to imply that the kingdoms of Babylon and Nineveh, which we know were united during the reigns of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon, still continued under one king, in the reign of Nabopalassar, which there is no reason to doubt, and every reason to believe.* Nabopalassar, then king of Nineveh, in

* Sennacherib conquered Babylon, Esarhaddon reigned at Babylon, his successor, called king of Assyria, carried Manasseh to Babylon, and Nebuchodonosor, a Babylonish title, reigned at Nineveh.

the time of whose reign Phraortes was slain, was the same as Nebuchodonosor, king of Nineveh, who slew Phraortes, or Arphaxad.

It must always be borne in mind that the reign of Nabopalassar is a fixed period in chronology, the Babylonian astronomers having recorded an eclipse in his fifth year, which we know from computation fell in B.C. 621. His thirteenth year therefore was B.C. 613. If, then, it is true that Phraortes was slain in his twelfth year, the reign of Cyaxares must have begun in B.C. 613; and, allowing forty years for its continuance, must have ended in B.C. 574, not in B.C. 595, where it is usually placed.

Secondly, let us identify this Nabopalassar with Sardanapalus, the last king of the Assyrian dynasty in Nineveh.

When I speak of Sardanapalus, I mean that king of Nineveh who sat last upon the throne of Assyria, before the barbarian hordes of Scythia took possession of Nineveh, and gained the empire of Asia, as we are told, for twenty-eight years. Sardanapalus certainly was not a Scythian; the title is Assyrian, as we know from the monuments. He ceased therefore to reign at least twenty-eight years before the final destruction of the city, which happened at the time of the expulsion of the Scythians. (Herod. i. 106.) Now we cannot interpose a reign even of moderate length, between the last year of Nabopolassar at Nineveh, B.C. 606, and the beginning of the twenty-eight years of Scythian rule, without bringing down the date of the final destruction of the city below what any one would contend for. Sardanapalus, therefore, did not reign

later than B.C. 606, or after Nabopalassar; and since he was the last of his dynasty, he could not have reigned before him; Sardanapalus therefore was Nabopalassar.*

This identification is confirmed by comparing the two lists of the later Assyrian kings, given in the next chapter, from Polyhistor and Abydenus. We there see that the fourth king from the Senecherim of Polyhistor is Nabupalsar, or Nabopalassar. The fourth king from the Senecherib of Abydenus is Sardanapalus.†

Polyhistor also speaks of Nabuchodrossor, who reigned forty-three years, as son of Sardanapalus. Now we know that Nebuchadnezzar, who reigned forty-three years, was son of Nabopalassar.

Sardanapalus, therefore, was Nabopalassar.

These preliminary points being thus settled, we shall find no difficulty in fixing the date of the final destruction of Nineveh, by following the simple narrative of Herodotus, who writes thus. Speaking of Phraortes, king of Media, he writes,—

"He came at length to the Assyrians, and proceeded to attack that part of them which occupied Nineveh. Hitherto the Assyrians had possessed the empire of Asia. Now they were deprived of their allies, who had separated from them; they were still, however, prosperous within their own territory. Phraortes having headed an expedition against them, in the twenty-second year of his reign, perished, together with the greater part of his army." (Herod. i. 102.)

* We may conceive the name of this monarch to have been simply Pul, or Pal: that in Babylon the name of the Babylonian god Nebo, was affixed, making Nabo, Pal, the Assyrian; and that in Assyria he was styled the Assyrian Adan-Pal, = Assur-adan-pal, or Sardanapalus.

† *See* p. 41.

Here we have a description of the state of the Assyrian empire, in remarkable agreement with that contained in the book of Judith, in the time of Nabuchodonosor, or Sardanapalus. Owing probably to habits of luxury and effeminacy, Nabuchodonosor in his twelfth year, B.C. 614, had lost his influence over his allies, so that when they were summoned to supply contingents for the war against the Medes, "they made light of the commandment,"—"neither went they with him to the battle" (Judith i. 11). "His allies," as Herodotus says, "had separated from him." Nabuchodonosor, however, "marched in battle arrāy" against the enemy, and "prevailed in his battle," and smote Phraortes, whose last year therefore was B.C. 614. The Assyrian king then relapsed into luxury, and "took his ease, and banqueted, both he and his army, an hundred and twenty days," quite in conformity with the character of Sardanapalus.

"Phraortes being dead, he was succeeded by his son Cyaxares, grandson of Deioces. This is the king who was carrying on war with the Lydians, when day became night, in the midst of one of their battles. Having collected all his forces, he marched against Nineveh, intent upon revenging his father's death, and also upon destroying the city. He conquered the Assyrians in battle, but while besieging Nineveh, a large army of Scythians, under the command of Madyes, son of Protothyes, came upon him. The Medes having been conquered in battle by the Scythians, lost the empire of Asia." (Herod. i. 103, 104.)

Cyaxares then came to the throne, in B.C. 613, being the king in whose reign the eclipse of B.C 585 happened.

and did not die, therefore, as is supposed, in B.C. 595. He conquered Nabuchodonosor, or Sardanapalus, whose twentieth or last year in Nineveh was B.C. 606, and in the same year Nineveh and the Assyrian empire fell into the hands of the Scythians. "The Scythians," says Herodotus, "held the empire of Asia for twenty-eight years, and then lost all by licentiousness and neglect. Cyaxares and the Medes having invited them (that is, their leaders) to a banquet, slew the greater part of them while in a state of intoxication. Thus the Medes recovered the empire and all that they were before masters of, and then took the city of Nineveh." (Herod. i. 106.)

Thus Cyaxares reconquered Nineveh twenty-eight years after it fell into the hands of the Scythians, that is in the year B.C. 579.

At this critical point Herodotus fails us, with a promise at some future part of his history to describe the particulars of the seige and capture of Nineveh, a promise not performed; fortunately, however, the Chaldæan book of Tobit, and fragments of Chaldæan history from Polyhistor and Abydenus, pick up the thread of the narrative at this particular point.

We are told by the author of the book of Tobit, that Tobias, who died at Ecbatana in Media, heard before his death of the destruction of Nineveh by Nebuchodonosor and Assuerus. (Tobit xiv. 15.) This Assuerus undoubtedly is the Cyaxares of Herodotus; and we learn from this passage and from this passage only, that Cyaxares having allied himself with his former enemy Nebuchodonosor, or Sardanapalus, the two kings proceeded together

to destroy Nineveh. Herodotus speaks only of Cyaxares as the destroyer of the city. Polyhistor and Abydenus tell us that it was Nabopalassar who destroyed it, which appears like contradiction. The book of Tobit clears up the difficulty by uniting the two kings in this expedition. Let us observe how remarkably the Chaldæan authorities support each other, and also support what we have collected from Herodotus. Eusebius, quoting Polyhistor, writes, "Nabopalassar, whom Polyhistor calls Sardanapallus, sent to Astyages, the satrap of Media, and demanded his daughter, Amuïtes, in marriage for his son Nebuchodonosor. He was the commander of the army of Saracus king of the Chaldæans, and having been sent upon some expedition, turned his arms against Saracus, and marched against the city of Ninus (Nineveh). But Saracus confounded by his advance set fire to his palace and burnt himself in it." *

Again, Abydenus writes, "After him (Sardanapallus) Saracus reigned over the Assyrians, and when he was informed that a very great multitude of barbarians had come up from the sea to attack him, he sent Busalossorus (Na—Busalossor, or Nabopalassar), as his general, in haste to Babylon. But he having with a treasonable design obtained Amuhea, the daughter of Astyages, the prince of the Medes, to be affianced to his son Nabuchodrossor, marched straightway to surprise the city of Ninus, that is, Nineveh. But when Saracus, the king, was apprised of all these proceedings, he burnt the royal palace, and Nabuchodrossor succeeded to the empire, and surrounded Babylon with a strong wall." †

* Cory's "Fragments," p. 59. † Ibid. p. 61

From the book of Tobit, then, we must infer, that an interval elapsed between the last year that Nabuchodonosor "reigned at Nineveh," and the time when we find him engaged with Cyaxares in the destruction of that city. From Polyhistor and Abydenus we collect that there actually was an interval, during which, or part of which, Saracus was on the throne; and from Herodotus we have seen that the interval was neither more nor less than twenty-eight years, during which the empire was occupied, by the Scythians, beginning, as we have before observed, in the year B.C. 606, and ending with the fall of Nineveh in B.C. 579.

Thus, by means of two fixed dates, viz., the eclipse of Thales, and the reign of Nabopalassar also fixed by an eclipse, we have been enabled to put together, in one continuous narrative, the histories of Judith, Tobit, Herodotus, Polyhistor and Abydenus, without contradiction or forcing of any passage; and to arrive at a definite conclusion as to the date of the fall of Nineveh, that fundamental date, as Dr. Hales describes it, for determining the true adjustment of sacred and profane chronology. Many, I have no doubt, will be disposed to reply, that Judith and Tobit are apocryphal books, and therefore of no authority; — that Herodotus must be mistaken; that Polyhistor and Abydenus are in error. With such persons it is difficult to argue. All I at present ask of them to admit is, that, reading these authorities as they are written, they lead to the result I have pointed out. They will find that there is nothing which contradicts it.

Before, however, we proceed further, I will dismiss as

briefly as possible, three objections, which may reasonably be raised against the conclusion that Nineveh fell in the year B.C. 579.

1st. Polyhistor and Abydenus speak of Astyages as prince or satrap of Media, at the time of the fall of Nineveh. Whereas Astyages, according to the above reasoning, did not begin to reign till the year B.C. 573.

2nd. Ctesias and Diodorus tell us, that Sardanapalus was the last king of Nineveh, and burnt himself in his palace; therefore, the city was destroyed in the year B.C. 606., not in B.C. 579.

3rd. The canon of Ptolemy places the accession of Nabokolassar, or Nebuchadnezzar, who reigned almost immediately after the destruction of Nineveh, in the year B.C. 604, not as I place the reign, in B.C. 578.

To the first of these objections, I reply, that nothing is more probable, than that Cyaxares, now growing old at the time of his proceeding to attack the Assyrians and to annex the kingdom of Nineveh to his dominions, should have placed his son Astyages, as prince or satrap over Media. It will be observed that he is not styled king, but satrap, by the historians. I see, therefore, no contradiction under this head.

With regard to the second difficulty, I reply, though Ctesias and Diodorus are correct in stating that the Assyrian empire ceased with Sardanapalus, and also that the last king of Nineveh sacrificed himself by setting fire to his own palace, they are incorrect in stating that Sardanapalus was that last king. In addition to the authorities we have already quoted, to shew that Scythian princes must have reigned after Sardanapalus

in Nineveh, we have Castor the Rhodian, who speaks of Ninus after Sardanapalus, probably, however, mistaking the name of the city for that of the king. And Cleitarchus expressly records, "in his fourth book of the Life of Alexander, that Sardanapalus died of old age after having lost the empire of Syria" (Assyria).* He is also said to have been buried at Anchiale, a city built by himself, not far from Tarsus, and near which place we trace him at the time of the eclipse of B.C. 585, with the army of Cyaxares, under the title Labynetus, or Nabynetus, so that he could not have burnt himself in his palace. Ctesias, though of high authority in Persian history, seems to have been ill informed on Assyrian matters; and his list of Assyrian kings receives no confirmation as yet from the monuments. Diodorus seems to have followed him, but their joint authority is of no weight in opposition to those which I have relied upon.

The third objection is of more importance, since the Canon of Ptolemy has always been looked upon as of very great weight and authority.

The compiler of the Canon supposes Nabopalassar to have died in the twenty-first year of his reign B.C. 605, and following probably the undoubted authority of Berosus, contained in an extract from his history preserved by Josephus, which states that his son Nebuchadnezzar succeeded to the throne immediately after his father's death, has placed the first year of Nebuchadnezzar or Nabokolassar in the year B.C. 604. But this is clearly an error in the Canon arising from a misapprehension of Berosus, whose history, I doubt not, was lost when the

* Athenæus, L. xii. p. 529.

Canon was compiled in its present form—for the arrangement is in fact in direct opposition to the authority of Berosus. What we read in Polyhistor is in fact what was written by Berosus, as will be shewn in the next chapter, and we have already seen from Polyhistor, supported by Abydenus, that when Nabopalassar obtained a Median princess for his son Nebuchadnezzar, just before the fall of Nineveh, he was no longer himself in independence on the throne, for he is distinctly represented as a vassal of the king of Nineveh, being merely called general or commander of his army. Nabopalassar, therefore, did not die in B.C. 605, but some interval must have elapsed between his twenty-first, or last, year on the throne of Nineveh, and the time of his son's marriage and subsequent accession to the throne of Babylon. But if we allow of any interval whatever, between the twenty-first of Nabopolassar and first of his son, the authority of the Canon at this point is at an end.

It would lead to too great a digression to discuss here the question of the date of the compilation of Ptolemy's Canon of Chaldæan kings: I will merely observe, that it could not have been known in its present form in the time of Berosus. If it had been so, Demetrius, who is no obscure writer, but ranked by Josephus with Philo and Eupolemus, and who wrote not long after Berosus himself, would not have placed the first year of Nebuchadnezzar exactly twenty-eight years lower than it now appears in the Canon. Nor, if the reign of Nebuchadnezzar had always held the same fixed position as now, in the era of Nabonassar, could the most learned Clemens of Alexandria have ventured to place it eight years

lower than its present position. Nor could Africanus, Eusebius, and Syncellus have ventured to place it where they please. The reigns of Mardocempadus, Nabopalassar, Cambyses, and Darius, which are marked by eclipses recorded in those reigns, must ever be immoveable; but where no eclipse is recorded, the reigns have been subject to alteration.

The reign of Nebuchadnezzar must ever be regulated by the date of the eclipse of Thales, after which event he began to reign—for Nineveh was taken after the eclipse: and Nebuchadnezzar began to reign soon after the fall of that city. This I consider to be a fundamental point in sacred chronology.

The fall of Nineveh we have found to have occurred only six years after the eclipse, that is in B.C. 579. The first of Nebuchadnezzar we place seven years after, that is in B.C. 578. So that there is little room left for alteration of either date. But as the reign of Nebuchadnezzar now stands in the received chronology,* the eclipse of Thales marks the third year after the destruction of Jerusalem. So that the fall of Nineveh, if this be correct, would have taken place after the fall of Jerusalem, and the war between the Lydians and Medes must have been raging during the time of the seige of Jerusalem, and during the plenitude of the power of Babylon All which no one would be hardy enough to maintain. I have no hesitation therefore in saying that the position of Nabokolassar, or Nebuchadnezzar, in the Canon must be incorrect.

Since the foregoing was written, an attempt has been

* See Blair's Tables.

made to shake the foundation of all that has been above argued, by denying the conclusion that the eclipse of Thales took place in the year B.C. 585. The argument runs thus:—The battle of Salamis was fought in the sixth or seventh year of Xerxes, B.C. 480.—Fifty years intervened between the battle of Salamis and the death of Cyrus, who, therefore, died B.C. 530.—Cyrus reigned twenty-nine years after Astyages, and Astyages reigned thirty-five years, together sixty-four years. Cyaxares therefore, the predecessor of Astyages, died cir. B.C. 594. "Hence if Cyaxares (in whose reign the eclipse of Thales closed the Lydo-Median war) died cir. 594, it follows, that the eclipse in question could not have occurred so late as B.C. 585."*

The strength, or weakness, of this argument turns upon the question, whether Herodotus was correct in stating that the twenty-nine years of Cyrus were wholly subsequent to the thirty-five years of Astyages. The answer is simple. When an author has put forth two inconsistent statements, concerning one of which he expresses doubt, it is unsound criticism to accept the doubtful statement, with a view to displace that concerning which no doubt is expressed, particularly when that which has to be displaced is of the stubborn nature of an astronomical fact. Now Herodotus has most candidly told us, and with his usual scrupulous desire to adhere to the truth, that what he relates concerning Cyrus was not generally received as certain in his days. He writes (L. i. 95), "I shall follow the authority of those Persians who *seem* more influenced by a regard to truth than any partiality to Cyrus; not

* "Journal of Sacred Literature," by Dr. Kitto, April 1853, p. 27.

ignorant, however, that there are *three other narratives* of this monarch ;" and again, after relating the death of Cyrus (L. i. 214), " This account of the end of Cyrus *seems* to me most consistent with probability, although there are *many other and different* relations."

It is surprising, therefore, that any one should gravely attempt to build an argument on the frail foundation of Herodotus' account of Cyrus, and to take a statement so hesitatingly and guardedly worded, as a fulcrum by which to displace an astronomical fact. But it is yet more surprising, when we consider that Herodotus has been set right, or at any rate contradicted, by two later historians, in this particular part of his Persian history. For Ctesias, who resided in the court of Persia, and had access to the historical records of that nation, which we know were preserved, tells us that Herodotus was mistaken in supposing that Cyrus, who conquered Astyages, was his grandson. He says there was no affinity between them, and that in fact Cyrus was born one generation earlier; and that after he had conquered Astyages, he married his daughter ; and also that Astyages was magnificently buried by Cyrus, which does not agree well with his deposition from the throne. Xenophon tells us that Cyaxáres succeeded Astyages when Cyrus was but a young man. Admitting, therefore, the inaccuracy of Herodotus in this particular, there seems no great difficulty in supposing, if necessary, that Cyrus, the son-in-law of Astyages, may have commenced his twenty-nine years reign in Persia, as descendant of Achæmenes, before he conquered Astyages. And this is the whole question. The grandson of Astyages, who conquered

Babylon, would appear to have been quite a different person, and of a later date. For Xenophon, after careful inquiry, relates, that when Cyrus, the grandson, conquered Babylon, Cambyses, his father, was still on the throne of Persia, and Cyrus himself not yet a king. So that the whole narrative of Herodotus concerning Cyrus was anciently considered a matter of doubt: how then can this most unsettled point in history be made use of to confute what astronomers have declared to be established "beyond the possibility of a doubt?"

On the one hand, Herodotus, without hesitation and in the most circumstantial manner, records one of the most remarkable events in ancient history, viz., the ceasing of a great battle between the Medes and Lydians, during the total darkness of an eclipse; which astronomers, in agreement with ancient history, say could have taken place only on one particular day within the range of fifty years. On the other hand, Herodotus says, I believe that Cyrus began to reign after the deposition of Astyages, though there are several other accounts, and two other historians contradict his statement. I leave the reader to determine, which of these statements affords the surest foundation for a sound chronological system.

CHAPTER III.

THE REIGN OF SENNACHERIB.

In the preceding chapter I have fixed the date of the final destruction of Nineveh to the year B.C. 579, and the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, to the year B.C. 578, arguing chiefly from Herodotus and the date of the eclipse of Thales.

I now propose to shew that the chronology resulting from these fundamental dates is precisely that which was adopted in that learned age of literature which followed the the conquest of Asia by Alexander the Great—that is to nearly six hundred years before Eusebius wrote, on whose authority subsequent chronologists have so much relied.

"It is one of the remarkable peculiarities of literature," writes Niebuhr, "that after the Macedonian conquests, the barbarous nations of Asia and Egypt were seized with a zeal to make their annals known to the Greeks—for historical works were composed, almost simultaniously, by Berosus at Babylon, Menander at Tyre, and by Manetho in Egypt."* The successors of Alexander we know cultivated learning in all its branches. If the zeal of the conquered was great to display their records, the zeal of the conquerors was not less to obtain a knowledge of what they could impart. Manetho was requested by Ptolemy Philadelphus to interpret the Hieroglyphic

* "Lectures on Ant. Hist." vol. i. p. 13.

records of Egypt; learned Jews were employed for the first time to interpret the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek; the Phœnician records were translated by Menander; history, mathematics, and chronology, were deeply studied, producing the great names of Euclid and Eratosthenes; the celebrated Parian Chronicle was compiled in the reign of Philadelphus; and the work of Eratosthenes on chronology, which is unfortunately lost, was produced in the following reign. In the great library of Alexandria was collected all that was then known of the histories of Assyria and Babylon. Then, if ever, the true chronology of those nations was known; for the national records of each country were in existence, and the object of research to most skilful and competent men. If, then, we could discover with reasonable certainty what was the chronology of those nations then entertained, and, as we have every reason to believe, reduced into tables by the Greeks, we should undoubtedly be far nearer the truth, than by adopting the systems of authors who wrote after the Christian Æra, in an age of comparative darkness.

Now, I shall be able to shew, that there are remains of Assyrian, Babylonian, Tyrian, Jewish, and Egyptian chronology, written in that learned age, bearing upon the latter days of the Assyrian empire, all supporting each other, and confirming in the most remarkable manner, even to a single year, the chronology which I have deduced from Herodotus and the eclipse of Thales.

To verify this assertion, I shall not examine these authorities with reference to the date of the fall of Nineveh, to which some of them do not refer: but shall

take the third year of Sennacherib, king of Nineveh, as a more convenient point. Because we know, from Assyrian monuments, that the third year of Sennacherib was that in which he came against Jerusalem, that is to say, it was the fourteenth year of Hezekiah. And, since the fourteenth year of Hezekiah in Scripture is exactly 111 years before the fourth year of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, which fourth of Jehoiakim* we know was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, the third year of Sennacherib must also have been exactly 111 years before the first of Nebuchadnezzar. If the reasoning, therefore, in the previous chapter is correct, which places the first year of the Babylonish king in B.C. 578, the year fixed by the several authorities I am about to examine, as that of the third of Sennacherib, should be found to be the year B.C. 689–8.

We learn from the same precious relick of Assyrian history, which synchronizes the fourteenth of Hezekiah with the third of Sennacherib, that the last year of Ululæus, king of Sidon and Tyre, fell also in the same year. From Herodotus, who also speaks of Sennacherib's expedition against Egypt, in this same year, we learn that Sethos was then king of Egypt. And from Scripture we know that Tirhakah, or Tarcos of Manetho, came in the same year from Ethiopia to oppose Sennacherib; and that Merodach Baladan, the son of Baladan, king of Babylon, was soon after on the throne of that province. So that Assyrian, Babylonian, Tyrian, Jewish, and Egyptian history, all come in contact with each other in this particular year, the date of which we now proceed to shew was B.C. 689–8.

* Jeremiah xxv. 1.

I. First, then, let us take the testimony of Berosus, an author of the highest authority, a priest of Babylon, a very truthful writer, highly esteemed both in his own country, and even at Athens, where a statue was erected to him, and always referred to by subsequent authors on the subject of Assyrian and Babylonian history. His work was composed about the year B.C. 268, and had been lost probably before the second century after Christ. Fortunately, however, sufficient extracts had been made by Polyhistor from his work, and have come down to us, bearing upon the very point we wish to determine. Alexander, the Polyhistor, wrote a universal history, about 100 B.C., and on Assyrian matters copied Berosus. Eusebius is very distinct upon this point. He writes, "From the time of Xisuthrus and the deluge to that at which the Medes took possession of Babylon, there were altogether eighty-six kings. Polyhistor enumerates and mentions each of them by name, from the volume of Berosus."* This is one of the passages recovered through the Armenian version of Eusebius, from which we learn that the list of Assyrian kings, from Senecherim, or Sennacherib, to Nabupalsar, given in the last chapter from Polyhistor, is in fact the list which was contained in the work of Berosus. By reference to that list, we find, that there were eighty-eight years between the first year of Sennacherib and the twentieth of Nabupalsar, or Nabopalassar. And since the twentieth of Nabopalassar is a fixed date, viz., B.C. 606-5, the first year of Sennacherib, according to Berosus, was B.C. 692–1, making his third year B.C. 690–89,

* Cory's "Fragments," p. 60.

that is to say, one year higher than what I suppose to have been the true date. Allowing, however, only seventeen whole years, or eighteen current, to Sennacherib, his third year would be B.C. 689–8.

Sennacherib began his warlike expeditions probably in B.C. 692. But I venture to assume, that according to the custom of dating every reign from the first month of the year following the accession, the first year of his reign in the Assyrian annals would be the year B.C. 691–90, making his third year B.C. 689–8. I make this correction with the more confidence, because we know from Scripture that it was the Sabbatical year in which Sennacherib threatened Jerusalem, because Isaiah says (xxxvii. 30), "Ye shall eat this year such as groweth of itself," implying a year when the land was not sown; and we shall presently see that the year B.C. 689–8 is one in the regular series of sabbatical years.

II. The next testimony is that of Demetrius, a learned Jew, who, as the custom then was, had taken a Greek name. He wrote in the reign of Ptolemy Philopator, about forty or fifty years after Berosus, and not many years after the great chronologist Eratosthenes, with the writings of both of whom we may conclude he was well acquainted. Demetrius is spoken of by Josephus, Clemens Alexandrinus, St. Jerome and Eusebius, from whom we learn that he was a Jewish writer of no mean repute. Scarcely any thing remains of his work, but what we have is most valuable, from the extreme accuracy of the dates. The extract to which I refer is found in Clemens Alexandrinus, and again most fortunately gives us the

very date we are in search of. The passage is so remarkable, that I will transcribe that portion of it which applies. It is thus given by Clemens. "Demetrius says, in his work concerning the kings of Judæa, that the tribes of Benjamin and Levi were not carried into captivity by Senacherim; but that from this captivity to the last captivity from Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, was a period of 128 years and 6 months. And that from the time when the ten tribes were made captive from Samaria (*i. e.*, in the reign of Shalmanezer) to the reign of the fourth Ptolemy (Philopator) was 400* and 73 years and 9 months. And from the carrying away from Jerusalem, 338 years and 3 months." †

Ptolemy Philopator came to the throne of Egypt in November, B.C. 222. Counting, therefore, 338 years and 3 months from that date, brings us to August, B.C. 560, for the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar; and adding, according to Demetrius, 128 years and 6 months, again to that date, to bring us to the time of the invasion of Sennacherib, we arrive at February, B.C. 688, or the latter part of the third year of Sennacherib, B.C. 689–8.

Demetrius and Berosus, therefore, have arrived at the same point, the one counting to the time of the captivity of the Jews under Sennacherib, not naming the year of that king's reign, the other without reference to the captivity, giving the precise date of the year of the Assy-

* In the original the word is πεντακοσια, five hundred, instead of τετρακοσια, four hundred. The emendation required is so obvious from the context, that it needs no comment.

† Clemens. Alex: Strom. i.

rian king in which we now know that the event took, place. Either, they calculated from independent data the one from Jewish, the other from Assyrian, which I believe to be the fact, which would be conclusive as to the correctness of their inference; or, they have both assumed the same date, as being that which was currently received in their days as that of the third year of Sennacherib, which is all that at present I contend for.

III. The canon of Ptolemy, as I have before observed, has always been considered of very great weight and authority. Syncellus in speaking of it, says, "The Chaldæan astronomers, and Greek mathematicians made use of it in the scientific drawing of their horoscopes, as is attested by the most learned Ptolemy;" and Mr. Dodwell, who had studied the subject, was of opinion that the earliest version of the Canon was made by Berosus himself. It has not come down to us, however, I am satisfied, quite as it was first written, as regards the reign of Nebuchadnezzar; but those reigns which are dependent on eclipses observed at Babylon, are of course immovably fixed, and I see no reason for altering any reign before Nabopalassar. Now, by taking the reign of Asaradinus, as placed in the most approved copy of the Canon, which, though not itself fixed by any eclipse, stands third before the fixed reign of Nabopalassar, we shall find another confirmation of the date we have fixed upon for the third year of Sennacherib. This Asaradinus of the Canon is no other than the Esarhaddon of Scripture, the son of Sennacherib; for his last year on the throne of Babylon is, according to this authority, B.C. 668–7, which is the very year in which the son of Sinecherim

ceased to reign at Nineveh, according to Polyhistor. He was placed on the throne of Babylon during his father's life, as Polyhistor informs us elsewhere, and reigned there thirteen years; but counting eight years for his reign in Nineveh, after eighteen years reign of Sennacherib, we are led to the same year as before for the first of Sennacherib, subject to the same rectification, which brings the third year of Sennacherib to B.C. 689–8.

IV. We next come to the important annals of the kings of Tyre. These annals are spoken of by Josephus* as having been open to the public: that is, they were engraved, probably, on marble, and set up in some public part of the city. They were transcribed by Menander from the Phœnician language into Greek, about the time when Berosus and Manetho wrote; and with Menander's Greek translation before him, Josephus writes, "Therein it was recorded that the temple was built by King Solomon at Jerusalem, 143 years and 8 months before the Tyrians built Carthage." What, then, is the date of the building of Carthage? Polybius, who is one of the most scrupulous and truthful of ancient historians, was living at the time of the fall of Carthage, and he says that Carthage was destroyed after having existed for 700 years.† The epitomiser of Livy gives the same number of years: Orosius‡ the same; and Solinus, as read by Scaliger,§ the same.

Carthage was destroyed in the year B.C. 146. It was built, therefore, according to these authorities, in the

* Cont. Apion. i. 17. † Appiani. Punica. viii. 132.
‡ Orosius, iv. 23.
§ Scaliger de emend. temp. notæ in fragmenta.

year B.C. 846. And if, dropping the eight months, we add 143 years to that date, we come to the year B.C. 989 for the building of the temple of Solomon, that is, to the fourth year of Solomon. But if we know the fourth year of Solomon, we also know the fourteenth of Hezekiah, for there were exactly 300 years between the dates. The fourteenth of Hezekiah, or third of Sennacherib was, therefore, as we have seen before, B.C. 689–8.

Niebuhr* proposes to place the building of the temple of Solomon even lower than 989. He would bring the date down to B.C. 956, or 180 years before the first Olympiad, by which the reigns of all the kings of Judah would be lowered far more considerably than they can possibly bear. He makes his calculation by adding 143 years to the date of the foundation of the city of Carthage, which he places in the year B.C. 813, and considers that date to be as historically certain as the date of the building of Boston or New York. Now, Niebuhr is probably right as to the date of the actual foundation of the city of Carthage. But he is incorrect in his inference. The 143 years of the Tyrian annals, are not to be counted from the actual foundation of the city, but from the time when the sister of Pygmalion fled from Tyre, with the intention of founding a city in Africa. Carthage was not built immediately on the arrival of Dido in Africa. Strabo tells us that the Island of Kothon, off the coast, was first occupied and fortified against the hostile Africans, who opposed her landing on the main shore.

Justin,† from Trogus, tells us, that a piece of land as

* "Lectures on Ant. Hist.," vol.iii. p. 159. † L. xviii. 6.

much as an ox hide might cover, was first purchased on the coast, a tradition which marks the difficulty in gaining her first footing in Africa. A citadel, called Byrsa, was then built. The people from the neighbouring places flocked there for the purpose of traffic, till at length it assumed the appearance of a small state. Ambassadors were sent from Utica another colony from Tyre: and the Africans becoming desirous of retaining the strangers, with the consent of all, Carthage was at length built. Thus a considerable interval must have elapsed between the landing of Dido and the building of the city. Polybius, Livy, Solinus, and Orosius speak therefore of the very origin of Carthage as a Tyrian settlement, at the time of the first landing. Niebuhr's date is that of the foundation of the city itself.

V. Again, from these same Tyrian annals, Josephus, in another place,* tells us, that one of the kings of Tyre, who was contemporary with Shalmanezer, reigned thirty-six years. His name was Elulæus. This is the same king that Colonel Rawlinson finds mentioned under the title Lulyia, in the annals of Sennacherib, found amongst the monuments at Nineveh. Sennacherib records that he conquered him in his own third year. Now in the Canon of Ptolemy we find a king called Ilulæus on the throne of Babylon, who began to reign in the year B.C 726: and this king has always been supposed to be the same as the king of Tyre. Counting then thirty-six whole years beginning in 726–5, we come to the year 691–90, and if we place the conquest of Ilulæus in

* Ant. ix. 14.

the following year, we again bring the third year of Sennacherib to B.C. 689.

VI. I must not omit the testimony of Abydenus as a writer on Assyrian history, though he adds nothing in precision to the conclusion drawn from the foregoing authorities. What he says, however, is confirmatory. It is uncertain when Abydenus lived; but it matters not to our purpose. For his account of Nebuchadnezzar was written with the history of Megasthenes in his hands, and it is not unreasonable to assume that he takes his facts concerning the kings of Assyria in general from Megasthenes, who wrote about eighty years before Berosus. Now Abydenus and Megasthenes have given titles to the Assyrian kings, differing in orthography from those recorded by Polyhistor and Berosus, and there has been much looseness in copying the names, either on their part, or that of their transcribers. They agree, however, in giving exactly the same number of reigns, between Sennacherib and Nebuchadnezzar. Thus:

	BABYLON.		NINEVEH.	
B.C.	Canon of Ptolemy.		Polyhistor.	Abydenus.
		yrs.		
			Senecherim . 18	Senecherib . .
680	Asaradinus . .	13	His son (Esarhaddon) 8	Nergilus (Nergal)
667	Saosduchinus .	20	Sammughos . 21	Adrammeles .
647	Kiniladinus .	22	His brother . 21	Axerdis his brother
625	Nabopalassar .	21	Nabupalsar or Sarda-napalus . . 21	Sardanapalus .
			Saracus . .	Saracous . .
604	Nabokolassar .	43	Sardanapalus and his son Nebuchodonosor.	Busalassorus and his son Nebuchodrossor.

The two lists of the kings of Nineveh are nearly identical, and if we may fix the dates of the list of Abydenus

by means of the Canon of Ptolemy, which I have added for the purpose, we might reasonably infer that Abydenus took the same view of the chronology of these reigns, as Polyhistor. I submit that there is a further reason for thinking that he did so from another passage from this author.

Eusebius refers to a list of the kings of Nineveh as given by Abydenus, from Ninus to Sardanapalus, and says that Abydenus counts sixty-seven years from the end of the reign of the last king to the first Olympiad.* Both Niebuhr and Mr. Clinton have inferred from this passage, that Abydenus placed the end of the Assyrian empire in the year B.C. 843, that is, sixty-seven years before B.C. 776; and Mr. Clinton observes that he differs from himself in this and the previous passage, to the extent of two hundred years.†

I cannot, however, bring myself to believe that any historian of the most ordinary pretensions could so far contradict himself. On the other hand, nothing is more common than an error in transcribing figures. It is more reasonable, therefore, to suppose that Abydenus wrote 167, not 67 years, from the fall of Sardanapalus to the first Olympiad, than that he should have so far contradicted himself. Now counting 167 years downwards from the first Olympiad, B.C. 776, would bring us to the year B.C. 608 for the fall of Sardanapalus, which is only two years earlier than the date collected from Polyhistor. Be this, however, as it may, the lists of Polyhistor, Abydenus, and the Canon of Ptolemy are in perfect harmony one with the other, excepting only

* Euseb. Chron. l. 12. p. 36. † Fasti Hellenici, vol. i. p. 273.

as regards the date of the reign of Nabokolassar, in the Canon, which I have shewn before to be incorrect; and whether right or wrong in their chronology, they all concurred in placing the reigns of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon at the same dates.

And now let me contrast this simple and consistent chronological arrangement of the Canon with the Armenian fragments of Polyhistor and Abydenus, to which I have referred, with the absurd contradictions which Mr. Clinton has drawn from them in his "Fasti Hellenici." Not with the view of detracting from that excellent and valuable work; but for the purpose of shewing the confusion which at every step attends the adoption of the received chronology. He writes, "It is plain that Abydenus and Polyhistor have confounded Sennacherib with Esarhaddon, and have ascribed to the father the acts which in reality belong to the son. Esarhaddon, under the name of Sardanapalus, was commemorated by the Greeks, as the founder of Tarsus and Anchiale."* And again, "Apronadius appears, on a comparison of the two historians with the Canon, to be no other than the son of Esarhaddon the Sennacherib of the two historians."† Thus, two most precious fragments of history are rendered perfectly valueless, and their authors set down as having written in total ignorance of their subject. Such lamentable conclusions, from so able a chronologist, can only be the result of the false system by which his reasoning was fettered.

Thus, from four independent authors, or five, if we take the Canon of Ptolemy as a separate authority, all

* Vol. i. p. 275. † P. 279.

of the third century before Christ—all writing when chronology and history were studied from authentic records then at hand, viz., Berosus, and the Canon, from Babylonian annals, Megasthenes from Assyrian, Menander from Phœnician, and Demetrius from Jewish annals, we obtain one uniform and consistent view of the chronology of the Assyrian empire; and four of these authorities concur in placing the third year of the reign of Sennacherib in the year B.C. 689–8. The evidence of Manetho only is wanting to complete, from Egyptian annals, the proof, that the chronology which has been deduced from Herodotus and the eclipse of Thales, is that which was universally adopted by the learned of the Macedonian age.

VII. Unfortunately the work of Manetho is lost, and we only know him through the medium of other writers. Africanus, however, copied from the work itself the lists of the several dynasties which reigned in Egypt; and has, I believe, honestly recorded the length of the 26th dynasty, with which we are concerned. Now, Manetho according to Africanus, makes the length of this dynasty 150 years, counted from the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses. If, then, we take the common date assigned to the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses, viz., B.C., 525, and add 150 years to that date for the length of the twenty-sixth dynasty, and also add eighteen years more for the reign of Tarcos, or Tirhakah, the last king of the twenty-fifth dynasty, we come to the year B.C. 693, for the first year of Tirhakah in Egypt. This date differs, to the extent of four or five years, from that which would agree with Berosus and the other authorities; so that, in this

view, we cannot say with certainty that Manetho used the same chronological tables, which they made use of. But if we examine a little closer, we shall find that there is an exact agreement between Manetho, Berosus, Menander, and Demetrius, even to a single year.

For Manetho did not place the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses in the year B.C. 525. I do not mean to deny that the fifth year of Cambyses, as "*great king*" over Persia and Babylon, was B.C. 525, because an eclipse at Babylon observed in the seventh year decides that point; but I think there is sufficient reason to believe, that he did not go down into Egypt in that year. Manetho appears to agree with the record of Ctesias, who assigns eighteen years to the reign of Cambyses in Persia, and thirty-one years only to the reign of Darius, the son of Hystaspes; and this mode of reckoning will bring us to exactly the same year for the death of Darius, as that adopted by Herodotus from Babylonish accounts.

That the reckoning of Ctesias was, in the days of Manetho, considered to be the true reckoning, we may infer from the Parian Chronicle, composed in the same period of literature, viz., in B.C. 264, which places the first year of Darius Hystaspes in B.C. 517, assigning only thirty-one years to his reign. That it was the particular view taken by Manetho, we may collect from Syncellus, and also from the Armenian version of Eusebius, both of whom in their record of Manetho's twenty-seventh dynasty, assign fifteen years to Cambyses *over Persia*, and three years over Egypt, making together the eighteen years of Ctesias. And that Ctesias has given the true length of the reign of Cambyses in Persia, partly as

viceroy, partly as great king, we may collect from Herodotus himself. For, though Herodotus only assigns eight years to the reign of Cambyses, including the usurpation of Smerdis, counted, as he supposes, from the death of Cyrus, he has at the same time mentioned a fact by which we are enabled to calculate his reign for ourselves. He tells us that, when Cyrus went on his expedition against the Masagetæ, in which he was slain, he placed Cambyses, according to a usual custom in Persia, in charge of the empire, and adds this important particular, that Darius, the son of Hystaspes, was then about twenty years of age.*

From this fact we are enabled to fix with precision the date of the expedition against the Masagetæ and the accession of Cambyses. For I have elsewhere shewn,† that Darius, the son of Hystaspes, who, according to Ctesias died at the age of seventy-two, or in his seventy-second year, completed his seventy-first year about the summer of B.C. 485; he would, therefore, have completed his twenty-first year in the summer of B.C. 535; and in the spring therefore of that year, when Darius was only twenty years of age, Cyrus set forth against Tomyris, leaving his son Cambyses as viceroy on the throne of Persia in his absence. But Cyrus did not return alive from that war, the reign of Cambyses therefore commenced from his viceroyalty. Now, the year B.C. 535 is exactly eighteen years before B.C. 517, or the first year of Darius, according to Ctesias and the Parian Chronicle, and so Manetho, I believe, counted his reign.

* Herod., i. 208—9. † "Athenæum," 4. Sept., 1852.—See Appendix.

I will not stop here to shew how Ctesias, the highest authority in Persian matters, has pointedly corrected Herodotus, and tells us that this Cyrus, who fell in battle, was not the grandson, but the son-in-law of Astyages, and gives us no reason to suppose that he ever conquered Babylon; nor how Xenophon, after accurate inquiry, differed from Herodotus, and has preserved the important fact, that Cyrus, grandson of Astyages, who was the conqueror of Babylon, was not at the time of the conquest, which I place in B.C. 530, on the throne of Persia, but merely commander of the armies of Media and Persia, his father Cambyses* being still on the throne, when Babylon fell. This must form the subject of another separate treatise. Suffice it here to say, that Cambyses, son of the son-in-law of Astyages, who was the king who conquered Egypt, according to Ctesias, came to the throne of Persia in the year B.C. 535, before his father's death.

But if he reigned eighteen years, even till B.C. 517, he must have been reigning also after the accession of of Darius Hystaspes, whose first year at Babylon was counted as B.C. 521, according to Ptolemy's Canon.

Now, this fact I believe to be recorded by Darius himself, in the famous inscription on the rock at Behistun; where the king thus speaks: "This is what I did, by the grace of Ormazd, *after* that I became king."† He then relates how Cambyses, who ruled in Persia before him, went into Egypt, and how Gomates personated

* Colonel Rawlinson has somewhere referred to an inscription shewing that Cambyses, who reigned over Babylon, had a son called Cyrus.

† "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," Vol. xiv. part i.

Bardes, the brother of Cambyses, and set up his throne in Media, when all the provinces revolted against Cambyses; and how he slew Gomates in a fortress in Media. Whether Darius had been placed by Cambyses on the throne of the province of Persia, previous to his intended long absence in Egypt, or whether Darius usurped the throne in his absence, does not appear. The words of the inscription, however, certainly seem to imply, that he considered himself to have become king before the death of Cambyses.

Be this, however, as it may, Manetho followed the reckoning of Ctesias, and placed the conquest of Egypt in the fifteenth year of Cambyses, that is in the year B.C. 520.

Now, if we count 150 years, the period of the twenty-sixth dynasty, plus the reign of Tarcos, or Tirhakah, eighteen years, in all 168 years, adding them to the year B.C. 520, we come to the year B.C. 688–7 for the first year of Tirhakah in Egypt, being the year which follows that which from Berosus and others we have fixed as the third of Sennacherib and fourteenth of Hezekiah. Tirhakah could not, consistently with Herodotus, have come to the throne earlier than B.C. 688–7, because he tells us that Sethos, or Sevechus, was on the throne in B.C. 689–8. And we should be surprised to find him coming to the throne even a year later, considering that this warlike prince had been called out of Ethiopia, at this very time, to assist the helpless Sethos, who was merely a priest, and it is highly improbable that such an opportunity of usurping the throne of Egypt would have been lost in those unscrupulous days, when power alone gave title to the throne.

But how, it will be asked, is the known length of the separate reigns of the twenty-sixth dynasty to be reconciled with the sum of them, given by Manetho as 150 years? The true length of the period it may be said is 160, not 150 years, because we know from an Egyptian tombstone now in existence, that there were seventy-one years from the third year of Necho II. to the thirty-fifth year of Amosis, so that one of the three reigns preceding Amosis must be lengthened ten years. Let us, with Herodotus, add ten years to the reign of Necho, and the list will stand thus:—

XXVIth DYNASTY.

Stephinates	7 years	
Nechepsus	6 „	
Necho I.	8 „	
Psammeticus	54 „	
Necho II.	16 „	6. Africanus.
Psammuthes	6 „	
Vaphres.	19 „	
Amosis	44 „	
	160	

How then can this sum total be reduced to 150 years, as stated by Manetho? Herodotus affords the means of clearing up the difficulty. For if we receive his account of the reigns of Apries and Amosis, there are several reasons for concluding that these two reigns lapped one over the other to the extent of at least ten years.

1st. Herodotus tells us that the cause of the war with Amosis, king of Egypt, was, that Cambyses having asked a daughter of that king in marriage, Amosis had deceived him by sending a daughter of the deceased king Apries, instead of his own. But if Apries had been dead forty years, no daughter of his could have been young enough.

If we believe the story, we must also believe that Apries lived for at least ten years after the commencement of the forty-four years reign usually given to Amosis.

2nd. Herodotus tells us that Apries did actually survive his defeat by Amosis. For he says that he was taken back *to his own palace* at Sais, and kindly taken care of there for some time; ἐνθᾶυτα δὲ τέως μὲν ἐτρέφετο ἐν τοῖσι βασιληιοισι, κάι μιν Ἄμασις ἐν περιεῖπε.* This kind treatment of the royal captive in his own palace is an important fact. It raises a strong presumption that he also continued to reign after his defeat. Usurpers are not in the habit of treating conquered princes with kindness, except for the purposes of their own ambition. Apries was so impressed with a feeling of the permanence of his reign in Egypt, that he was persuaded that not even a deity could unseat him. If such was really his position in the affections of the Egyptians, we may readily understand the reluctance of Amosis to put him to death: and we may reasonably assume that Amosis retained him in his palace with the nominal title of king as long as it suited his own purpose, assuming the actual government into his own hands, as mayor of the palace; till at length having firmly established his own power, he suffered Apries to fall into the hands of his enemies, who put him to death.

3rd. Apries was buried with kingly burial, in the tomb of his ancestors. He died therefore a king. He died during the forty-four years of Amosis, and not less than ten years after his defeat by that king.

The conquest of Apries by Amosis I conceive to have taken place in his tenth year, B.C. 564, and that he was

* Herod. ii. 169.

put to death in his nineteenth year, B.C. 555. So that a double reckoning was made of the reign of Amosis. Undoubtedly his years were counted as forty-four by his friends, and probably by himself towards the end of his reign, and this reckoning would commence in B.C. 564.

But, as surely, we may conclude, that as long as Apries was above ground, the nobles at least of Egypt would not so have counted them, but would have continued to count the years of Apries till his death, beginning the years of Amosis in B.C. 555; for we are expressly told by Herodotus that, owing to his plebeian origin, Amosis was held in supreme contempt during the early part of his reign.

Any person of distinction, therefore, in recording the age of a deceased relative by the years of the reigns in which he had lived, would have given nineteen years to Apries, and only thirty-five to Amosis; and such, I conceive, to be the nature of the record of the years of Psammetich on the tombstone referred to, who, from his name, we may infer was of noble, if not of royal, race.

Thus the ten years necessarily added to the reign of Necho are again deducted from the reign of Amosis, and the total length of the twenty-sixth dynasty is reduced to 150 years, in accordance with Manetho; and thus, therefore, we find that the chronology of Egypt as well as that of Assyria, Babylonia, Tyre, and Judæa, concurs with that which we have deduced from Herodotus and the eclipse of Thales.

There are but two other nations which can be supposed to have possessed chronological records bearing upon the period of history which we are considering, viz., the Medes

and the Lydians. We will conclude this chapter by shewing that the Median and Lydian records also lead to the same result.

VIII. Median chronology.

We have already seen, in the second chapter, that Cyaxares, king of Media, in whose reign the eclipse of Thales took place, succeeded his father Phraortes in the year B.C. 613, nor is it possible, consistently with the date of the eclipse and his conquest of Nineveh, to place his accession much higher. Herodotus informs us that his father, Phraortes, reigned twenty-two years, and Deioces fifty-four years, together seventy-six years, which added to B.C. 613, brings us again to the year B.C. 689–8, or third of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, for the first year of Deioces. Now this is exactly what we are told by Josephus, who, after mentioning the illness of Hezekiah, which we know was in his fourteenth year, writes, "At this time the Medes cast off the dominion of the Assyrians."* This revolt then was about the third year of Sennacherib; and the book of Tobit, which lets us into the palace itself of Sennacherib and his father, confirms this statement of Josephus, and leads us to believe that the revolt of the Medes followed soon after the death of Shalmanezer, thus,—"when Enemessar (Shal-enemessar) was dead, Sennacherib his son reigned in his stead; whose estate was troubled, that I could not go into Media."† We may accept such historical particulars, which were preserved by the descendants of Tobit probably from writings left by him, without entering into the legendary additions subsequently made to them.

* "Jos. Ant." x. 2. † Tobit, i. 15.

IX. Lydian chronology.

The Lydian empire never came into contact with that of Assyria, the one having risen while the other was beginning to fall. We can gather nothing, therefore, from Lydian chronology bearing directly upon the reign of Sennacherib. But it is important to observe that the Parian chronicle, which fixes one of the most important reigns in Lydia, viz., that of Alyattes, fixes it in accordance with the chronology I have laid down, and the marble record must be altered before it can be made to harmonize with the current system. It was Alyattes who protected the fugitive Scythians, who claimed his protection against Cyaxares, and who carried on war, for six years, with Cyaxares, till the year of the eclipse. But Alyattes did not begin to reign, according to the Parian chronicle, till the year B.C. 605. The Scythian occupation of Nineveh, therefore, during which the fugitives came to Alyattes, must have taken place after the fall of Sardanapalus, in B.C. 606, not before, which decides the main question we have been discussing.

Since writing the above, the work of Mr. Johannes von Gumpach of Heidelberg, entitled "Die Zeitrechnung der Babylonier und Assyrier," has come into my hands. It was published in 1852, and I am pleased to see that we arrive at the same conclusion with regard to the date of Sennacherib's reign, the first year of which he places in the year B.C. 691. He also identifies Asaradinus of the Canon with the Esarhaddon of Scripture. This confirmatory opinion in support of what has been argued above, is of the more weight, since Mr. Gumpach in forming it has had to struggle against

formidable difficulties, arising out of his adoption of an erroneous date for the eclipse of Thales, and yet feels himself compelled to lower the reigns of Sennacherib and Hezekiah. He has followed the calculation of his countryman Oltmann, who places the eclipse in the year B C. 610, the consequence of which is, that his dates for the reign of Josiah and for the fall of Nineveh, and also for the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, stand many years higher than I have placed them. When, therefore, the reign of Hezekiah is brought down by him to the extent of eighteen years below the common date, he finds himself involved in difficulty, and is compelled to curtail the reign of Deioces in Media to the extent of twenty years, and the same process is adopted with the reign of Manasseh, king of Judah, who is made to reign thirty-five, instead of fifty-five years.

Now it is true, that this shortening of the reign of Manasseh has the support of the Septuagint translation of the Bible. But that no such reading was ever found in the Hebrew original, is I think certain, for the following reasons:—

1st. Demetrius, writing in the third century before Christ, tells us that there were 128 years and six months between the time of the destruction of Jerusalem and the fourteenth of Hezekiah, which exactly agrees with the present reading of the length of the several reigns in the Hebrew.

2nd. Josephus, writing three hundred years later, and professing to copy from the Hebrew original, says, that the interval between the captivity of the ten tribes, and of the two tribes, was 130 years, six months, and

ten days.* Here it will be observed, that Josephus differs from Demetrius and the Hebrew text, which make the interval 134 years and six months. Taking, however, the text of Josephus even as it stands, it is against the idea that the present reading of the Septuagint was that of the Hebrew in his days; and considering how loosely most of his dates have been transcribed, the probability is that he wrote 134 years and six months, and that the four years have been omitted by the transcriber.

3rd. The words of the prophet Ezekiel,† writing six hundred years before Josephus, are decisive against the idea of shortening the reign of Manasseh, king of Judah, to the extent of twenty years. For he defines the period as exactly 390 years between the revolt of the ten tribes under Jeroboam, who caused Israel to sin, and the seige of Jerusalem, which period cannot be made up without the fifty-five years of the reign of Manasseh.

This period of 390 years is one of the most important in the Bible towards the accurate adjustment of sacred chronology, and no one is justified in lightly setting it aside. That the German chronologists should have ventured to do so, is a strong instance of their heathen bias against the authority of the sacred Scriptures and preference for any shred of profane history. Neibuhr, indeed has not cared to investigate such chronological data. But Mr. Gumpach has made the period from Jeroboam to the destruction of Jerusalem one of the main features of his system, and has deliberately curtailed it

* Ant. x. 0, 7. † Ezek. iv. 5.

from 390 to 350 years, against all authority whatever. I cannot help remarking also on Mr. Gumpach's unpardonable rashness in rejecting the positive statement in Scripture, that Sennacherib's sudden retreat from Judæa was caused by the destruction of the greater part of his army by pestilence from the direct hand of God, and his attempt to account for this retreat as caused by mere political combinations formed against him at home; thus substituting the figments of his own brain for the express decree of the Almighty declared by his prophet.

Another work* on the same subject has been published in the course of this year by Mr. Johannes Brandis, of Bonn, who is equally perplexed by the adoption of Oltmann's date for the eclipse. He proposes to count eighty-eight years from the first year of Sennacherib, not as Polyhistor reckons them to the end of the reign of Nabopalassar, but to the beginning of that reign.

* "Rerum Assyriarum tempora emendata."

CHAPTER IV.

INSCRIPTIONS AT NINEVEH.

WHILE we are endeavouring to determine the time of the reign of Sennacherib from the faint, though at the same time generally faithful, records of ancient history, it is an interesting fact, that the annals of this king are now, after a lapse of more than 2500 years, being recovered from his own palace and other places about ancient Nineveh, in all the freshness of the day on which they were written. There can be little doubt that, within a few years from this time, we shall know as much of the date and history of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, as we now know of the reign of William the Conqueror of England. The chamber of records in his palace has been laid open by Mr. Layard, the floor of which he found strewed with baked tiles, covered with inscriptions in the minutest characters, written, as it were, with the point of a diamond,* recording, it is said, the decrees and expeditions of the kings who inhabited that palace.

"Many cases," says Mr. Layard, "were filled with these tablets before I left Assyria, and a vast number of them have been found, I understand, since my departure. A large collection of them is already deposited in the British Museum. We cannot overrate their value. They furnish us with materials for the complete decipher-

* Jer. xvii. i.

ment of the cuniform character, for restoring the language and history of Assyria, and for inquiring into the customs, sciences, and, we may, perhaps, even add, literature of its people. The documents which have been discovered at Nineveh, probably exceed all that have yet been afforded by the monuments of Egypt."*

In the annals of Sennacherib which have partly been deciphered, mention is made of a period of 418 years,† counted from the time of an ancient king, and expiring in the first year of Sennacherib, proving that chronological records were kept by the Assyrians at Nineveh, as correctly as we know they were kept during the same period by the Phœnicians at Tyre. And Mr. Layard thinks, "it is highly probable, that a record of astronomical observations may exist," amongst the documents which have been sent to this country. If so, we may ere long be enabled to fix with mathematical precision the whole chronology of the Assyrian empire.

In the meanwhile, I believe that in the record of the third year alone of Sennacherib's reign, in the translation of which both Colonel Rawlinson and Dr. Hincks substantially agree, we have sufficient materials for fixing with accuracy the date of that king's reign. I have already pointed out how in my opinion this may be effected. But I return to the subject, because Colonel Rawlinson and Dr. Hincks have, from the same materials, argued in support of the received chronology. It is only with the greatest deference and with the highest sense of the abilities of those eminent philologists, that I venture to differ from the chronological conclusions

* Layard's "Nineveh and Babylon," p. 347. † p. 213.

which they have drawn. It is chiefly through their labours that the public have become acquainted with what little they already know of the contents of the Assyrian inscriptions; and it is to be lamented that their abilities have not been enlisted on behalf of the public in laying open the mass of unexplored matter which has accumulated in the British Museum.

"In my third year," says Sennacherib, "I went up to the country of the Ketta (or Hittites). Luliya, king of Sidon (the Elulæus of Menander), had thrown off the yoke of allegiance. On my approach from Abiri he fled to Yetnan, which was on the sea coast. I reduced his entire country." ..... "I placed Tubaal on the throne in the place of Luliya, and imposed on him the regulated amount of tribute" ..... "and because Hezekiah, king of Judæa, did not submit to my yoke, forty-six of his strong fenced cities, and innumerable smaller towns which depended on them, I took and plundered" ..... "and because Hezekiah still continued to refuse to pay me homage, I attacked and carried off the whole population, fixed and nomad, which dwelled about Jerusalem, with thirty talents of gold, and 800 talents of silver."* From this short extract we obtain the important data, that the third year of the reign of Sennacherib, was the last of the reign of Ilulæus, king of Sidon (and Tyre), who reigned thirty-six whole years, and the year also of the invasion of Judæa by Sennacherib, that is the fourteenth of Hezekiah. We know also from Scripture that it was the Sabbatical year of the Jews; and, again, that it was the year in which Tirhakah passed

* "Outlines of Assyrian History," by Col. Rawlinson. Twenty-ninth Report of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1852.

through the territories of Sethos, king of Egypt, with a large army to oppose Sennacherib; and, probably, therefore, the year when Tirhakah superseded that helpless king. It is impossible, therefore, as I have shewn, putting all these facts together, to place the third of Sennacherib anywhere but in the Sabbatical year B.C. 689–8, which is the year pointed out by all ancient authorities. Dr. Hincks, however, places it in the year B.C. 701, Colonel Rawlinson in B.C. 713, neither of which years were Sabbatical, and neither of which agree with other records of Sennacherib in profane history. Dr. Hincks deduces his date chiefly from an important discovery which he has made in the reign of Sargon, who is mentioned by Isaiah,* and who, in the inscriptions, is found to be the father† of Sennacherib. He writes,—

"In the Khorsabad inscription, Botta 65. 2, I found, what I had long sought in vain, the date of the conquest of Babylon. The war is said to have commenced in the twelfth year of Sargon. It is also stated here, as well as in 151. 13, and other texts, that Marduk-bal-adan, king of Chaldæa, was subdued after he had held Babylon for twelve years. This is the exact length of reign given in the Canon to the king called Mardocempadus; and I cannot hesitate to adopt the opinion, that this name is a corruption of Merodach-Baladan."‡

No one will be disposed to dispute the importance or correctness of this conclusion. But when Dr. Hincks adds, that Marduk-baladan of the inscriptions is there described as the son of Yagin,§ and then infers, that he is the same as Merodach Baladan described by Isaiah‖

* Isaiah xx. i. † (!) grandfather.

‡ "Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy," vol. 22, p. 364.

§ p. 365 ‖ Isaiah, xxxix. i.

as the "son of Baladan," I cannot follow him. He forms his chronology thus:—

JUDÆA.	SAMARIA.	B. C.	BABYLON.	NINEVEH.	
	1 Hosea	728			
	2	7		Shalmanezer	
	3	6	Ilulæus 1		
Hezekiah 1	4	5	2		
2	5		3		
3	6	Sab {4	4		
4	7	{3			
		2	5		Shalmanezer besieges Samaria.
5	8	1	Mardocempadus 1	Sargon 1	
6	9	720	son of 2	2	Sargon takes Samaria.
7		9	Yagin. 3	3	
8		8	4	4	
9		Sab {7	5	5	
10		{6	6	6	
11		5	7	7	
12		4	8	8	
13		3	9	9	
14		2	10	10	Hezekiah's illness.
15		1	11	11	Sargon takes Ashdod.
16		Sab {10	12	12	takes Babylon.
17		{9	Arcianus 1	13	
18		8	or 2	14	
19		7	Sargon 3	15	
20		6	4	16	
21		5	5	17	
22		4	Son of Sargon 1	18	
23		Sab {3	Acices & Morodach-	Sennacherib 1	
		{2	Baladan Belibus 1	2	
24		1	2	3	Sennacherib invades
25		700	3	4	Judæa.
26		9	Apronadius 1	5	
27		8	2	6	
28		7	3	7	
29		Sab {6	4	8	
		{5	5	9	
		4	6		
		3	Regibelus 1		
		2	Mesessi Morodach 1		
		1	2		
		690	3		
		Sab {9	4		
		{8			
		7			
		6			

Now the reign of Mardocempadus being fixed by two eclipses observed at Babylon, the discovery that Sargon began to reign in the same year with that king is certainly most important, as it gives a fixed point in Assyrian chronology from which to calculate. We learn, thus, through Dr. Hincks, that Sargon, who, according to the inscriptions, took Ashdod in his eleventh year, took it in B.C. 711. We may attach this date, therefore, to the contents of the 20th chapter of Isaiah, which speaks of the capture of Ashdod by order of Sargon. But Isaiah does not speak of the sickness of Hezekiah till his 38th chapter. That sickness therefore—which we know was in his fourteenth year, since he reigned fifteen years after it, and in all only twenty-nine years—is related, and therefore we presume occurred, after the capture of Ashdod. There are five objections to the arrangement of Dr. Hincks, which I would state thus:—

1st. That the fourteenth of Hezekiah could not be B.C. 712, where he places it, because that year is before the taking of Ashdod B.C. 711, and Isaiah places it after.

2nd. That the 14th of Hezekiah does not fall, as it ought, in the Sabbatical year.

3rd. The very reverse of what he has inferred, with regard to the time of Hezekiah's reign, is the legitimate conclusion from his discovery, that Mardocempadus was son of Yagin. He could not, therefore, be the "son of Baladan," who was on the throne of Babylon in the fourteenth of Hezekiah, or soon after, and who sent to inquire concerning his health, and concerning the wonder which was done in the land.* It is clear, that we

* 2 Chron. xxxii. 31; 2 Kings xx. 12

cannot place the year of the coming of the ambassadors from Babylon to Jerusalem from the "son of Baladan," till after the death of Mardocempadus, "son of Yakin," not till after the death of his successor Arcianus, who is supposed to be Sargon. Again, this "son of Yagin" is found on the throne of Babylon, in the first year of Sennacherib, according to Dr. Hincks, B.C. 703. The message from the "son of Baladan," therefore, was not sent till after that date, according to his own table, nor therefore till after the reigns of Belibus, and Apronadius, and Regibelus, kings of Babylon, nor earlier therefore than B.C. 692, when indeed we find Mesessi-Merodach on the throne of Babylon. Mesessi-merodach may be, therefore (as Mr. Gumpach supposes), the Merodach-Baladan of. Scripture, but not necessarily so.

The prophet Isaiah, who was at Jerusalem when the ambassadors arrived, says distinctly, that it was Merodach-Baladan the "*son* of Baladan" that sent them. It would not be unreasonable, therefore, to assume, that the king so called was the son of Merodac-*Baladan* son of Yakin, and that he came to the throne, therefore, one generation later than Mardocempadus of the Canon.

Now Polyhistor, from Berosus, mentions a king named Merodach-Baladan, who was on the throne of Babylon for about six months, just twenty-six years after the last year of Mardocempadus. This, therefore, I take to be the prince who sent the ambassadors to Hezekiah, being one of "the princes of Babylon" spoken of in the book of Chronicles. The embassy took place either in the year B.C. 684 when he appears to have

been on the throne, or a year or two sooner, before he had violently seized the government. For it does not appear necessary to conclude that he was on the throne at the time of sending the embassy, which was rather of a scientific than political nature, to inquire concerning the wonder in the land.

Dr. Hincks has incorrectly, I think, inserted this prince in the Canon, from Polyhistor, at the year B.C. 703.

The words of Polyhistor run thus: "After the reign of the brother of Sennecherib, Hagisa reigned over the Babylonians, and when he had governed for the space of thirty days, he was slain by Merodach-Baladan, who held the empire by force during six months. He was slain and succeeded by a person named Elibus. But in the third year of his reign Sennecherib king of the Assyrians levied an army against the Babylonians, and in a battle in which they were engaged routed and took him prisoner with his adherents. Having taken upon himself the government of the Babylonians, he appointed his son Asordanes their king, and he himself retired again into Assyria." * Now Asordanes here spoken of is the Asordan of the Septuagint † son of Sennacherib, who is the Esarhaddon of the Hebrew, and the Asaradinus of the Canon, as we have before shewn; not Apronadius, as Dr. Hincks with Mr. Clinton supposes. And since Asaradinus came to the throne in B.C. 680, Merodach-Baladan who preceded him in the fourth year before that date was on the throne in B.C. 684, not 703.

* Cory's Fragments, p. 62.

† The Septuagint was written about the time of Berosus, and speaking of the murder of Sennacherib, reads: καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν Ἀσορδὰν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀντ᾽ αὐτοῦ.

4th. The 14th of Hezekiah, according to Dr. Hincks, falls in the reign of Sargon, instead of the reign of Sennacherib, which is contrary to Scripture. And Sennacherib's invasion falls in the 25th of Hezekiah instead of the 14th, which is fatal to the scheme.

5th. We are asked to believe that it was Sargon, not Shalmanezer, who destroyed Samaria in the sixth year of Hezekiah; though we read, in xvii. 5. ii. Kings, that "the king of Assyria went up to Samaria and besieged it three years," and in the following chapter *v.* 9, that in the 4th of Hezekiah, "Shalmanezer came up against Samaria and beseiged it."

Such is the invariable state of confusion, arising from the application of the received system of Scripture chronology to any ascertained date in profane history. Simply, it never tallies. The following table I submit for consideration, as tending to illustrate the Scripture narrative, and as appearing to produce harmony between Scripture and profane chronology during the period it covers, though I by no means intend to assert that it is necessarily in every point the true arrangement.

New readings from time to time from the inscriptions will probably modify many of its details; but the general outline I think will prove to be correct. At all events it is necessary, before I proceed further, to show the impossibility of Dr. Hinck's arrangement being the true one; for, if it be correct, all that I have here written, must fall to the ground, the received system must be admitted, and the chronological question is at an end. I am persuaded, however, that his arrangement cannot stand; and while I acknowledge the great importance of his

discovery of the identity of Mardocempadus of the Canon with the son of Yakin of the inscriptions, that importance in my opinion consists in the fatal blow which is thereby given to the received chronology, which assumes that Mardocempadus is the same as the "Merodach-Baladan, son of Baladan" of Scripture, which is impossible.

SAMARIA.	JUDÆA.	B. C.	BABYLON.	NINEVEH.	
Pekah 12		721	Mardocempadus 1	Sargon 1	14 Tiglath Pileser
13		0	or 2	2	15
14		9	Merodach 3	3	16
15		8	Baladan 4	4	17
16		Sab 7	son of Yakin. 5	5	18
17	Ahaz 1	Sab 6	6	6	19
18	2	5	7	7	10
19	3	4	8	8	21
20	4	3	9	9	22
21	5	2	10	10	23
22	6	1	11	11	24
23	7	Sab 10	12	12	25
24	8	Sab 9	Arcianus 1		26 ii. Kings xv. 29
25	9	8	or 2		27
26	10	7	Sargon 3		1 Shalmanezor
27	11	6	4		2
28	12	5	5		3
Hosea 1	13	4			4
2	14	Sab 3			5
3	15	Sab 2	Bolibus 1		6
4	Hezekiah 1	1	2		7
5	2	700	3		8
6	3	9	Apronadius 1		9
7	4	8	2		10
8	5	7	3		11
9	6	Sab 6	4		12
	7	Sab 5	5		13
	8	4	6		14
	9	3	Regibelus 1		15
	10	2	Mesessi Morodach 1	Sompachoribus 1	16
	11	1	2	1	
	12	690	3	2	
	13	Sab 9	4	3	Invades Judæa. B.C. 688
	14	Sab 8		4	Hez.'s illness in B.C. 687
	15 Jubilee	Sab 7		5	
	16	6		6	
	17	5	Hagisa	7	
	18	4	Merodach Baladan	8	
	19	3	Elibus 1	9	
	20	Sab 2	2	10	
	21	Sab 1	3	11	
	22	680	Asaradinus 1	12	
	23	9	2	13	
	24	8	3	14	
	25	7	4	15	
	26	6	5	16	
	27	Sab 5	6	17	
	28	Sab 4	7	Esarhaddon 1	
	29	3	8	2	
		2	9	3	
		1	10	4	
		670	11	5	
		9	12	6	
		8	13	7	

In this table, it will be observed that the reign of Sargon is fixed as Dr. Hinck's proposes. Sennacherib's reign is fixed according to Berosus and others, and the result is, that the several chapters of Isaiah appear to come in regular chronological order, thus,—

Isaiah.	VII = 1st	Ahaz.	B.C. 716
	XX = 11th	Sargon	711
	XXXVIII = 14th	Hezekiah	688

It will also be observed, that an interval occurs between the last year of Sargon and the first year of his son (or grandson?) Sennacherib, instead of the reign being consecutive as Dr. Hincks proposes. This is not at all improbable, since Sargon appears not to have been the legitimate king, but an usurper. Tiglath Pileser, and Shalmanezer I suppose to have reigned during this interval; or possibly, Samuel Aniensis,* an Armenian bishop of the twelfth century, may have preserved the true record of the respective reigns, viz., sixteen years for the reign of Shalmanezer, and twenty-seven for the reign of Tiglath Pileser, in which case this latter king must have reigned simultaneously with the usurper Sargon. That the legitimate king deposed by Sargon (Shalmanezer, according to Dr. Hinck's,—Tiglath Pileser, as I suggest), was still alive in the sixth year of Sargon, is pointed out by Dr. Hincks,† and Tiglath Pileser would therefore have retained his title of king of Assyria, though Sargon actually occupied his throne. No monument of Shalmanezer has yet been discovered to settle this point, and it may be some time before it is set at rest, for Sargon and his son Sennacherib probably destroyed, as far as possible, all

* Edit. "Zohrab. et Mai.," p. 16. † p. 366.

traces of the lawful kings. All I mean to insist upon here is, that Dr. Hincks' discovery of the true date of Sargon's reign does not necessarily affect the position of the reign of Sennacherib.

Another result of this arrangement of the reigns of Sargon and Tiglath Pileser is, that Pekah must have reigned twenty-eight years, not twenty only. This appears to me more agreeable to Scripture, on comparing ii. Kings, xv. 30, (where there is an error in transcribing,) with xvii. 1, than the usual mode of arranging the reigns of Pekah and Hosea, with an interval of eight years between them.

Colonel Rawlinson differs from Dr. Hincks in one most important particular, inasmuch as he considers that Sargon and Shalmanezer are the same king. He places the first year of the reign of Sargon in the year B.C. 747, and the first year of Sennacherib in B.C. 716. He seems, however, rather to have adapted his readings of the inscriptions to the received chronology, assuming that to be fixed, than to have endeavoured to fix the chronology of the kings of Assyria from the historical data in their inscriptions. From the last report of the Royal Asiatic Society* he appears to have collected a mass of new and valuable materials for future consideration. He speaks of an Assyrian almanack, running over a period of several years,—of what he terms a grammar and dictionary of the language,—and of records of astrono-

* Read in May, 1853. It is not generally known that Government has granted a sum of £1000 to this Society, to enable them to publish the discoveries of Colonel Rawlinson, and that they appear from time to time in the reports distributed to the members.

nical observations. These last are of the utmost importance to the settlement of the chronology of the times, and I trust will be submitted to an early examination. It is too much to expect that we shall find amongst them any allusion to the astronomical phenomenon which appeared to Hezekiah in his fourteenth year on the dial of Ahaz at Jerusalem, though we know how much interest that event had excited amongst the Babylonian astronomers of the time, who sent an express embassy to Jerusalem to inquire concerning "the wonder done in the land." It is interesting, however, to remember that any records of this nature which may have been discovered in the palace of Sennacherib, must have been made about the time when this sign in the heavens was manifested to Hezekiah.

CHAPTER V.

SCRIPTURE CHRONOLOGY.

In the previous chapters I have endeavoured to establish the following important dates and synchronisms, upon historical and astronomical evidence of the most weighty, if not indisputable character: and each date stands independently of the support of Holy Scripture, viz.:—

	B. C.
I. That the building of Solomon's temple was begun in the year	989—90
II. And that the dedication therefore was in . . .	983—2
III. That the third year of Sennacherib king of Nineveh, and the invasion by him of Judæa in the reign of Hezekiah, was in the year	689—8
IV. That the final destruction of Nineveh was in the year	579
V. That the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, was	578
VI. And the nineteenth, when he carried away the two tribes and burnt the temple of Jerusalem, was . . .	560

In the present chapter I propose to shew, from the record of Holy Scripture, taken independently of all heathen authorities, that these same dates are assigned to the same events in Scripture chronology.

And here I will remark, that I see no reason why the authority of the Hebrew writers should yield for an instant before the authority of classical historians, taken even without reference to the divine superintendence under which they wrote. On the contrary, I see reasons for attributing greater weight to historical facts

related by the Hebrews, than to much that is related by the earliest Greek historians. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah all wrote before Herodotus, and of events which occurred under their own eyes. The three latter moved in the courts, and understood the language of the kings of Persia of whom they wrote. While the "father of history," as he is called, from whose excellence as an historian I by no means would wish to detract, was probably not acquainted with the language of Persia, and living after most of the events of which he wrote, had to trust to the comparatively hasty information which he could collect as a traveller from native Persians.

Should then the account of Herodotus be found at any time at variance with that of Daniel and Ezra, my decided inclination is to prefer the latter. If Daniel speaks of Darius; I shall not conceive that he alludes to Cyaxares; or, if Ezra refers to Ahasuerus, which is undoubtedly Xerxes,* I shall not feel at liberty to transform that title into Cambyses. My belief, however, is that when rightly understood no great discrepancy will be found between the historians; but that when due weight is given to the Hebrew authorities in Persian matters, a light is thrown upon the history of the period which will enable us, with some slight correction, to reconcile Herodotus with other Greek authorities, and to rescue him from some absurd incongruities in which his history is involved, as it is usually interpreted by historians and chronologists. For instance, we are accustomed to receive without much inquiry the legendary

* Khshayarsha in the inscriptions. His queen was Amestris or Esther.

tale related of Cyrus, and it is even placed by many as the basis of all ancient chronology. We are told that this king first conquered his grandfather, Astyages, and then his grandfather's brother-in-law, Crœsus, and that this Crœsus survived his grand-nephew Cyrus, who is said to have lived seventy years, and not only so, but also the son of his grand-nephew, viz., Cambyses, with whom he went into Egypt as his advisor, little troubled, as it would appear, by the weight of his own years. Such is the unsound matter which lies at the foundation of our chronological system. It is time indeed that contemporaneous authorities, who ever they may be, should be allowed to speak for themselves.

It is a fact, which I am satisfied will one day be recognized, that the Hebrew Scriptures contain a system of chronology, from the date of the birth of Christ upwards, for a thousand years, if not for a considerably longer period, more perfect than can be drawn from the records of any heathen nation whatever, at least as they are at present understood.

The foundation of Hebrew chronology lies in the septennial division of time into sabbatical years and jubilees, which the Israelites were commanded to observe from the time of their entrance into the promised land. It is not necessary to shew that this command was obeyed by them, and that the years were regularly observed. On the contrary, we know that the command was most wilfully neglected; and it is from the recorded period of non-observance of these Sabbaths, and from the precise term of the punishment inflicted for the neglect of them, that we are enabled to ascertain the series of

appointed years. The sabbatical years could not indeed have been observed by the ten tribes, from the time of their revolt under Jeroboam, who instituted a feast in the eighth month,* for the express purpose of preventing the observance of the ordinances of the seventh month, in which the sabbatical years commenced. But this sin of Jeroboam and the ten tribes was recorded against them, and constantly referred to by the prophets of Jerusalem, till it was at length summed up against them in a period of 390 years by Ezekiel, so that the reckoning was not lost. Likewise also we know that the remaining two tribes had not observed their sabbaths, even from the time of the dedication of the temple of Jerusalem by Solomon, *i. e.*, for thirty years before the sin of Jeroboam, till the time of the siege of Jerusalem, making in all 420 years; for the the prophet Jeremiah informed them that they should remain in captivity seventy years, that the land might enjoy her sabbaths, "to fulfil three score and ten years"† or the complement of 420 ordinary years. Though the observance of the sabbatical years therefore was neglected, the computation was not omitted by the prophets, and from time to time feeble efforts appear to have been made at their instigation, to observe what was written in the law concerning the sabbath or year of release, all which attempts we shall find fell in years which were in the regular series of sabbaths. There are also one or two notices of the year of jubilee, from which, whether faithfully observed or not, we may deduce the series.

* 1 Kings xii. 32. † ii. Chron. xxxvi. 21.

I am aware that Dr. Prideaux * has declared that the sabbatical years and jubilees are uncertain, and useless in settling the history and chronology of the Jews; and such indeed is the fact, as long as we adhere to the chronological reckoning which he followed, with which nothing defined in history or astronomy seems to tally. But when the dedication of Solomon's temple, and the consecration of the Holy City in that event, is placed as it ought to be, and as we shall find it fixed in Scripture, in the year B.C. 982, we immediately recognize the two-fold period of seventy sabbatical weeks which is distinctly referred to in Scripture: the first portion, or period of seventy weeks, ending with the seventy sabbaths enjoyed by the land while Judæa lay desolate, computed to the reign of Darius, the second portion beginning from the same point, and ending in the birth of Christ, B.C. 3., making together a period of 2 + 490 + 490 = 982 years.

It is not my intention to enter at any great length into the question of the mode of computing the sabbaths and jubilees. All that can be said upon the subject with any degree of certainty, may be comprised in a very small compass, thus :—

1st. The sabbatical years were computed from the month Tisri, or from Autumn to Autumn, while the ecclesiastical year was computed from Spring to Spring.

2nd. The sabbatical years *after* the return from captivity at Babylon, were computed by the Jews *in regular series without interruption, septennially.* This may be proved from the notice, by Josephus, and the 2nd Book of Maccabees, of three sabbatical years actually ob-

* Prideaux's "Connexions," Preface.

served, viz., in B.C. 164–3—136–5, and 38–7, all of which are at intervals from each other divisible by seven.*

3rd. Ezra revived the observance of these years after the return from captivity.† And it is not too much to assume as certain, that he commanded that they should be computed in the same manner that they were computed by the holy men of Israel before the captivity, that is to say, that Ezra, after the captivity, and the prophets before the captivity, both interpreted the command of Moses in the same manner; and, therefore, that the sabbatical years were computed in unbroken series septennially before, as well as after the captivity.

4th. With regard to the jubilee, the command was, "And thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years, and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years, then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound in the tenth day of the seventh month"——"and ye shall hallow the fiftieth year."—Leviticus, xxv. 8, 9, 10.

Thus, the first jubilee that was observed, or commanded to be observed, was to follow immediately on the completion of the seventh sabbatical year, so that two fallow years, during which the land was not to be cultivated, but left to produce of its own accord, were to follow in immediate succession. I cannot, therefore, understand the argument of those who say, that the jubilee must have been disjoined from the sabbatical year, owing to the difficulty, as they assume, of keeping two fallow years in succession, once in forty-nine years.

* All this is fully entered into by Petavius De Doctrina Temporum. L. ix. cap. 27.

† Nehemiah x. 31.

As was the first Jubilee, so were the rest. If one could be so observed, so could all. And as the jubilee therefore was always to follow immediately on the completion of the sabbatical year, and the series of those years was continuous and unbroken, each succeeding jubilee must have been computed after an interval of forty-nine, not of fifty years, so that the fiftieth year, or jubilee, was always computed as the first of the following period of forty-nine years.

Such is the plain meaning of the command; and I know of no fact which implies that any other interpretation was put upon it by the Jews while in possession of their own land.

The principal observances which marked the sabbatical year, were—

1st. That no one should sow his land, or prune his vineyard; that what grew of itself should not be reaped or gathered out of the field, but be eaten in the field, and be common to all.—Levit. xxv. 4, 5, 6.

2nd. That the book of the law should be read "at the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release."—Deut. xxxi. 10.

3rd. That at the end of every seven years they should make a release; and it is said, if thy brother an Hebrew man or an Hebrew woman be sold unto thee, and serve thee six years, then in the seventh year (or year of release, *v.* 9), thou shalt let him go free from thee.—Deut. xv. 1—12.

The observances which marked the year of jubilee, were—

1st. That the land should return to its original possessor in that year. Levit. xxv. 13.

2nd. That the land should not be sown or reaped, but that the increase thereof should be eaten out of the field. v. 12.

3rd. It was the custom to consecrate the walls of cities which had walls. Since the houses within the walls, and the houses without the walls, were subject to a different law in the year of jubilee.—Levit. xxv. 29, 30, 31; Maimonides de Jur. Anni. Sept. et Jubilæi ch. xii. 14.

That the continuous series of sabbatical years was not broken by the captivity, and a fresh series commenced when the observance was revived under the second temple, may be shown from the books of Jeremiah and Zechariah. We know from the first of these prophets that in the ninth year of the reign of Zedekiah, on the tenth day of the tenth month, *i. e.*, about the end of December, the army of the Chaldæans took up their position to besiege Jerusalem.* Some little time before this, we are not told how long, the people of Jerusalem at the request of the king, had set free their Hebrew slaves, in obedience to the command, "at the end of seven years let ye go every man his brother an Hebrew, &c.,"† and having again brought them into bondage, on the temporary withdrawal of the Chaldæan army, they were told by the prophet that the army should return to the city and destroy it. From the commencement of the siege of Jerusalem God's indignation against the city began to be poured out. Judæa then became desolate, and the land being left uncultivated began to enjoy her Sabbaths, "to fulfil three score and ten years." The act of Zedekiah and the people, which indicates the pre-

* Jerem. xxxix. 1. † xxxiv. 8- 14.

sence of the sabbatical year, took place, we may assume, in the summer or autumn before the siege began, shortly before the withdrawal of the Chaldees; and the sabbatical year will have ended, therefore, in the autumn of the ninth year of Zedekiah. Now three score and ten years counted from the beginning of the siege, would have ended in December of some one year of Darius Hystaspes, even according to the current mode of computation, which no one on this point would be inclined to dispute; and accordingly in the 24th day of the eleventh month, February, in the second year of Darius, these words were uttered: "O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, against which thou hast had *indignation* these three score and ten years."* But if these years of indignation began, as we have seen, immediately after a Sabbath, they must have terminated also with a Sabbath. From autumn, therefore, in the first year of Darius, to autumn in the second of Darius, ought to be a sabbatical year. And this we find was the case. For the second year of Darius the Median, as king over the realm of the Chaldæans, was the year B.C. 492, in the autumn of which a sabbatical year ended. Not that I suppose the Jews really observed that year as such; but it is one in the regular series of septennial years computed from those known to have been instituted by Ezra.

The series of sabbatical years, therefore, was not interrupted by the captivity at Babylon; and as we know three of the years which were observed after the return from captivity, we may, if they were continuous, compute the rest with unerring certainty, thus—

* Zech. i. 7–12.

PERIOD OF THE FIRST TEMPLE

SERIES OF SEVENTY SABBATICAL YEARS COMPRISING SEVENTY WEEKS FROM THE DEDICATION OF SOLOMON'S TEMPLE TO THE FIRST YEAR OF DARIUS THE MEDIAN.

Temple Finished in B.C. 983—*Dedicated in* 982.

B.C. September,			
976—5	850—9	724—3	598—7
969—8	843—2—20	717—6	591—0
962—1	836—5	710—9	584—3
955—4	829—8	703—2—40	577—6
948—7	822—1	696—5	570—9
941—0	815—4	689—8	563—2—60
934—6	808—7	682—1	556—5
927—6	801—0	675—4	549—8
920—9	794—3	668—7	542—1
913—2—10	787—6	661—0	535—4
906—5	780—9	654—3	528—7
899—	773—2—30	647—6	521—0
892—1	766—5	640—9	514—3
885—4	759—8	633—2—50	507—6
878—7	752—1	626—5	500—9
871—0	745—4	619—8	493—2—70
864—3	738—7	612—1	
857—6	731—0	605—4	

70 weeks or 490 years.

"And Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about three score and two years old," Dan. v. 31. That is to say, in the year B.C. 493.

And "in the first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes," the angel declares, "seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the

vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy."—Dan. ix. 24. Thus a second period of seventy weeks begins where the first terminates, to be fulfilled in the anointing of Messiah, the Most Holy.

PERIOD OF THE SECOND TEMPLE.

SERIES OF SEVENTY SABBATICAL YEARS, COMPRISING SEVENTY WEEKS FROM THE FIRST YEAR OF DARIUS TO THE BIRTH OF CHRIST, AND OF SIXTY-NINE SABBATICAL YEARS FROM THE DEDICATION OF THE TEMPLE.

First year of Darius the Median being about 62 years old, B.C. 493.
Temple Dedicated B.C. 486.

B.C. September			
486—5	346—5	206—5	66—5
479—8	339—8	199—8	59—8
472—1	332—1	192—1	52—1
465—4	325—4	185—4	45—4
458—7	318—7	178—7	38—7
541—0	311—0	171—0	31—0
444—3	304—3	164—3	24—3
7—437—6	20—297—6	40—157—6	60—17—6
430—9	290—9	150—9	10—9
423—2—10	283—2—30	143—2—50	62—3—2—7
416—5	276—5	136—5	
409—8	269—8	129—8	
402—1	262—1	122—1	
395—4	255—4	115—4	
388—7	248—7	108—7	
381—0	241—0	101—0	
374—3	234—3	94—3	
10—367—6	30—227—6	50—87—6	
360—9	220—9	80—9	
353—2—20	213.2—40	73—2—60	

Series of seven weeks and sixty-two weeks from the going forth of the commandment to build Jerusalem to Messiah the Prince.

Commandment issued between B.C. 498 *and* 486.

Seven weeks or 49 years, end in B.C. 437 *28th of Artaxerxes Longimanus.*
Sixty-two weeks, or 434 years, counted from B.C. 437 *to* B.C. 3.

It will be seen that the key to the foregoing arrangement, and indeed the point upon which the whole scheme of the sabbatical period turns, is the historical fact that Darius, the son of Hystaspes, was sixty-two years old in the year B.C. 493. In that year, in the first year of his reign *over the Chaldeans*, I understand the prophet to say, "I, Daniel, understood by books the number of the years whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the *desolations of Jerusalem*." And what was the consequence of this conviction in the mind of Daniel? "I set my face," he says, "unto the Lord God to seek by prayer and supplications with fasting, and sackcloth and ashes." ..... "O, Lord, I beseech Thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from *thy city Jerusalem*" ..... "and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is *desolate*," ix. 1—3—16, 17. The obvious inference is that, because the period of desolation was now coming to an end, Daniel set himself to pray that the city and sanctuary might be restored; I cannot, therefore, bring myself to believe that this prayer, which Daniel tells us was made in the reign of Darius, was really spoken in the reign of Cyaxares; and that the prophet meant to express, that the seventy years' desolations of Jerusalem were to cease about twenty years after the time he was praying, that is to say, in the reign of another Darius, the son of Hystaspes; nor that he prayed that God would cause his face to shine upon the desolate sanctuary, either twenty years before the time predicted by Jeremiah, or twenty years later than his prayer, as strange to say is implied by the received Scrip-

ture chronology. I submit that the only just conclusion is, that the seventy years of desolation of the city were at the time of his supplication nearly complete, and that the answer immediately given to his prayer, "seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city," must convey, that seventy weeks, or 490 years, were to be computed from the time when God's anger and fury should be turned away from his city Jerusalem, v. 16, that is, on completion of the seventy years of "indignation." Now, we have already seen from the prophet Zechariah that the threescore and ten years of indignation against Jerusalem ceased in the second year of Darius,* concerning whom there is no dispute that he was the son of Hystaspes. So that if Scripture is allowed to speak for itself, Darius the Median of Daniel, and Darius, the Persian of Zechariah, are one and the same king, viz., Darius, the son of Hystaspes, the only sovereign with that title of whom we find any record about the time of the captivity, and seventy sabbaths were ended, and a second period of seventy sabbaths commenced in his reign. It is unnecessary here to enter into any proof of the fact, that Darius Hystaspes was sixty-two years old in B.C. 493, as that has been already shown elsewhere.† In what manner he was made king over the realm of the Chaldæans in that year, may be the subject of future consideration. Both Cyrus and Darius it will be remembered, are spoken of by Herodotus as kings of the Medes.

This scheme, which places the first year of Darius in B.C. 493, enables us to combine in one single reign all

* Zechariah i. 14. † *See* Appendix.

that is said by Daniel, Ezra, Haggai, and Zechariah concerning Darius. 1st. The seventy years desolation of Jerusalem cease in the beginning of the reign of Darius the son of Hystaspes, of the seed of the Medes, when he was made king over the realm of the Chaldæans, Dan. ix. 1. 2nd. The seventy years indignation against Jerusalem (Zech. i. 12.) terminate in the beginning of the same Darius. 3rd. The age of Darius (Dan. v. 31) is about sixty-two in that year. 4th. The year B.C. 493 is in the regular series of sabbaths as we have shown the first and second of Darius ought to be. 5th. The foundation of the second temple was laid (Haggai ii. 18.) immediately after the termination of the period of anger against Jerusalem. 6th. It is the point of union between two periods of seventy sabbatical weeks each, the latter of which must in some way terminate with the anointing of the Messiah.

There are two other arrangements with which this scheme may conveniently be compared at this point. One is the common reckoning, which supposes the Darius of Daniel to be Cyaxares, and the Darius of Ezra, Haggai and Zechariah to be the son of Hystaspes, placing his first year in B.C. 521, when he first came to the throne of Persia. The other is that of Scaliger and many others, who place the first year of Darius in the year B.C. 422, when Darius Nothus came to the throne.

Now the first of these arrangements combines many of the points required by Scripture. 1st. The seventy years indignation against Jerusalem, and the seventy years desolation of the city, terminate in the reign of Darius Hystaspes. 2nd. The year 521 is in the regular series of sabbatical years. 3rd. It terminates a period of

seventy sabbatical weeks reckoned upwards to the dedication of the temple of Solomon. 4th. The foundation of the second temple is laid at the termination of the period of indignation. The scheme fails, however, inasmuch as, with the usual inconsistency of the received reckoning, Darius is supposed to be Cyaxares. Daniel is made to pray for the restoration of Jerusalem twenty years before the predicted period of desolation had ceased. We know nothing of the age of Cyaxares in B.C. 538. And no second period of seventy sabbatical weeks, to the anointing of the Most Holy, can be reckoned from the year B.C. 521.

The scheme of Scaliger, which many seem inclined in these days to adopt, contains only one of the characters required by Scripture, viz., that B.C. 422 was in the regular series of sabbaths. It fails inasmuch as neither the seventy years indignation, nor the seventy years desolation of Jerusalem terminate in that year. We know nothing concerning the age of Darius Nothus in B.C. 422. The year B.C. 422 is neither the beginning nor the ending of any period of seventy weeks referred to in Scripture. It is, indeed, the beginning of seventy weeks, terminating in the destruction of the second temple, A.D 70, that is to say, reckoned to the desecration of the Holy of Holies, but not as Scripture requires, terminating in anointing the Most Holy, the Messiah.

There is one decisive answer also to this latter scheme, viz., that the prophet Haggai appealed, in the second year of Darius, to some who could remember the first temple. But the first temple was destroyed 139 years, at least, before B.C. 421, or second of Darius Nothus.

It is clear that no other scheme than that which I have proposed, can possibly unite the two periods of seventy weeks, which Scripture points out as meeting in the first year of Darius. And without that requirement no scheme can be correct.

Of the years set down as sabbatical under the first temple, we find, in the fifteenth year of Asa, that after a long neglect of the law of Moses, an attempt was made to renew the covenant,* and the book of the law was probably read in the sabbatical year B.C. 919, as commended by Moses. In the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, in the sabbatical year B.C. 688, we know that the sabbath was observed, and they eat in that year what grew of itself, and did not cultivate the land, as was ordained. In the eighteenth year of Josiah, in the sabbatical year B.C. 597, "the king went up into the house of the Lord, and all the men of Judah, and the priests and the Levites great and small, and he read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant,"† as was commanded to be done in the year of release. And lastly an attempt was made, as already observed, by Zedekiah, in the sabbatical year B.C. 562, to observe the command in the year of release, by setting free the Hebrew slaves.

Under the Second Temple there is every reason to believe from Josephus, that the sabbatical years were strictly observed, and that every year set down as such in the foregoing table, after the time of Ezra, was so observed.

Let us now say a few words on the subject of the year of Jubilee.

* ii. Chron. xv. 10. 12.

† ii. Chron. xxxiv. 30.

There is only one indubitable reference to the observance of the year of Jubilee under the first temple, viz., that contained in ii. Kings xix. 29, where the prophet Isaiah, after declaring that the army of Sennacherib shall return to Assyria, and not besiege Jerusalem, adds, "and this shall be a sign unto you, ye shall eat this year such things as grow of themselves, and in the second year that which springeth of the same: and in the third year sow ye and reap, and plant vineyards, and eat the fruits thereof." Here is a distinct reference to two consecutive fallow years, which could only take place on the arrival of the year of Jubilee, which followed the seventh sabbatical year. Yet it has been said on Jewish authority of no mean weight,"* "we positively deny, that before the passage in Nehemiah x. v. 32 any notice is taken in Scripture of the occurrence or date of the sabbatical year or of the Jubilee." So that the words of the prophet can only be explained, as referring to the hostile occupation of the land by Sennacherib, which prevented cultivation for two successive years. But we know that this hostile occupation of the land lasted no such length of time. We are told (v. 35) that the destruction of Sennacherib's army took place on the "*same night*" that the deliverance of the city was foretold. The prophet also says, "ye shall eat *this* year such things as grow of themselves," possibly signifying that the foreign army had for that season interfered with the sowing of the land. But why should he add, and in the *second* year that which springeth of the same, after the foreign army should have been withdrawn? It is clear that some

* In a review of my former work by a very acute and cultivated Jew.

other reason for not cultivating the soil in the second year must have prevailed. Sennacherib himself, in his annals at Nineveh, informs us that his army was otherwise engaged in this second year, and was not then in Judæa. The meaning of the words of the prophet will appear more plain, on reference to the original institution of the sabbatical year and Jubilee.

During the sabbatical year it was commanded, "thou shalt neither sow thy field, nor prune thy vineyard: that which groweth of its own accord of thy harvest thou shalt *not reap*,"——"the sabbath of the land shall be meat for you." During the year of Jubilee it was commanded, "thou shalt not sow neither *reap that which groweth of itself*,"——"*ye shall eat the increase thereof out of the field.*" Now the meaning of the command is this. The owner of the soil shall not be at liberty during these years of rest to appropriate to himself the produce, either by reaping the corn or gathering the grapes to carry them home. But the spontaneous productions of the soil shall be open to the people in general, to gather and eat in the field.

The presence of an hostile army round Jerusalem would of course have prevented the due observance of the law. The prophet Isaiah, therefore, says concerning Sennacherib, "he shall not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow there, nor come before it with shield," &c.—— "and this shall be a *sign* unto you," that is, a proof and a memorial unto you of the truth of my words. Ye shall not be prevented, by the army now threatening the walls, from eating in the field that which groweth of its own accord this year, nor the next year, nor the third

year, when ye shall sow and reap, and plant vineyards, &c In what other way could the eating of the fruits of the field, the sowing and reaping, be a sign that Sennacherib should *not* come before the city? His army was destroyed in the first of the three years, and could not, therefore, prevent the sowing in the second. The sign then was, that the people of Jerusalem should be able to gather for two successive years that which grew spontaneously in the field. And such successive gathering could only take place when the Jubilee followed the sabbatical year.

The correctness of this inference is clearly proved, by counting the length of the several reigns of the kings of Judæa from the dedication of Solomon's temple to the fifteenth of Hezekiah, which is exactly 392 years, or six periods of seven weeks, or forty-nine years each. The fifteenth year of Hezekiah was, therefore, the sixth year of Jubilee under the first temple. But by this mode of reckoning we obtain no positive date, from Scripture alone.

Let us, then, again count from the fifteenth year of Hezekiah downwards, according to the usual length assigned to the several reigns, four periods of Jubilee, or 196 years, and we come to the point when the seventy years of indignation against Jerusalem ceased, *i. e.*, to the second year of Darius. Now, if we could show that a Jubilee commenced in the second year of Darius, that year being a fixed scriptural date, viz., B.C. 492, we should be led up to the year B.C. 688–7 for the fifteenth of Hezekiah, in strict agreement with the date obtained from profane history.

Jewish tradition of very early date records, that the

year in which the second temple was commenced, which we know was in the second year of Darius, was a year of Jubilee. Rabbi Eliezer, who wrote either in the first or third century, and who is one of the most esteemed Jewish authorities, has a passage to this effect: "Ezra, Zerubbabel, the son of Schealtiel, and Joshua, the son of Jehotzedech, went up from Babylon, and began to lament in the temple of the Lord, as it is said, Then arose Zerubbabel, the son of Schealtiel, &c. Against them the Samaritans came in battle to the number of 180,000. But how are they Samaritans? Were they not in fact Cutheans? But they were called Samaritans from the name of the city Samaria. They endavoured also to put Nehemiah to death, as implied in their words, Come let us consult together in some of the villages, &c. (Neh. vi. 2). Moreover, they formerly impeded the work of God (*i. e.* the restoration of the temple), for two years, *even to the year of Jubilee.*" *

There is a distinct reference to the year of Jubilee in Ezekiel.† All that we can gather concerning it is, that it would arrive some time after the fall of Jerusalem. For, speaking of the siege of Jerusalem, he says, "Let not the buyer rejoice, nor the seller mourn—for the seller shall not return to that which is sold, although they (the buyer and seller) *were yet alive.*" This passage is quite sufficient to prove that the reckening of the Jubilees was preserved.

We now come to the period of the second temple, during which I collect that one Jubilee, and one Jubilee only,

* Rabbi Eliezer. Pirke. Vorst's Latin translation, p. 101.

† Ezek. vii. 12, 13.

was foretold to be observed. We shall also find reason to conclude that the first Jubilee under the second temple, which fell in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, was actually observed, at least in some particulars. We might infer, that the computation of the new æra of Sabbatical weeks and Jubilees, introduced by Ezra, would have commenced from the date of the dedication of the second temple, as we find it had commenced from the dedication of the first temple under Solomon. Maimonides informs us that such was the fact. For he says, "In the seventh year from the building (of the new temple) Ezra went up, and for the second time brought back or restored (the æra). And from that year they began to compute another æra, constituting the thirteenth year of the second temple a sabbath. They computed also seven sabbaths and consecrated the fiftieth year. For though the Jubilee may not have been observed, yet under the second temple they made the computation, that they might consecrate the sabbaths.* This thirteenth year computed from the second year of Darius B.C. 492, was the sabbatical year B.C. 479–8, which we find in the regular series of sabbaths actually observed, as established by Ezra, being the end of the first week after the dedication of the new temple in B.C. 486–5.

Scripture also leads us to the same conclusion. For Daniel (ix. 25) writes, "Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be *seven weeks*, and three score and two weeks: the street shall be built again *and the wall*

* Maimonides de Schemitha et Jubilæo, cap. x.

even in troublous times." Here is a period of sixty-nine sabbatical weeks ending with the appearance of Messiah the Prince; ending at the same point, therefore, with the seventy weeks which terminate with the anointing of the Messiah. They must be computed, therefore, from one week later than the first of the seventy, viz., from B.C. 486–5.

But it will be asked, was the command to restore and to build Jerusalem issued in that year? We cannot say with certainty in what year this command was issued. All we know is, that in the eight month of the second year of Darius the command had not then gone forth. For the prophet Zechariah, in that year, describes a man in vision, "with a measuring line in his hand, to measure Jerusalem, to see what is the breadth thereof, and what is the length thereof." (Zech. ii. 1, 2). It was not also till the fourth year of Darius, B.C. 490, that Jerusalem had completed her seventy years of desolation, counting from the capture of the city by Nebuchadnezzar. Now if the command to build the city was issued any time between B.C. 490 and 486, that is to say in the midst of the first week, there could only be sixty-nine whole weeks from the command to the Messiah, which weeks could only count from the year B.C. 486–5, even if the building of the city had commenced a year or two before. The seven weeks of Daniel, therefore, which, as Sir Isaac Newton observed are the period of a Jubilee,* must be computed from B.C. 486–5 and end therefore in the sab-

* "As the seventy, and sixty-two weeks, were Jewish weeks ending with sabbatical years, so the seven weeks are the compass of a Jubilee, and begin and end with actions proper for a Jubilee."—Newton on Daniel p. 133.

batical year B.C. 437–6, that is in the twenty-eighth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, in which year we are informed by Josephus that the wall of Jerusalem was completed. The dedication of the wall, which was accomplished with great pomp and ceremony, fell I conceive in the following year B.C. 436, or twenty-ninth of Artaxerxes, being the fiftieth year from the dedication.

The date and history of the building of the wall of Jerusalem by Nehemiah, are very minutely given by Josephus, who concludes his account with these words: "And this trouble he (Nehemiah) underwent for two years and four months, for in so long a time was the wall built, in the twenty-eighth year of Artaxerxes, in the ninth month."* The book of Nehemiah speaks of the wall having been finished in fifty-two days,† in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes,‡ and in this short period the breaches in the wall may have been filled up. But to complete the gates, and to perfect the wall, must have taken a much longer time. "Yea also, I continued in the work," says Nehemiah, "of this wall, neither bought we any land."§ Josephus refers to the time of the final completion of the work, which, by his account, was of such magnitude, that he says, he (Nehemiah), hath the walls of Jerusalem as an eternal monument for himself.‖

Now, what reason is there for believing that a Jubilee was actually observed in the year B.C. 436? Neither Ezra nor Nehemiah give us any reason to believe, that the command, to cease from cultivating the land for two suc-

* Ant. xi. 5—8. † Neh. vi. 15. ‡ ii. 1.
§ Neh. v., 16. ‖ Ant. xi., 6—8.

cessive years, was observed at this time. But it will be remembered, that one of the ceremonies to be observed in the year of Jubilee, was the consecration of the walls of cities, because the tenure of houses was differently regulated, according to their position within or without the walls, and this ceremony was observed. I will close these few remarks on the subject of the Jubilees, by what Maimonides says concerning this period. "After the destruction of the first temple," he says, "the Israelites went into exile, and the consecration of the walled cities of Joshua ceased. When Ezra, however, went up into the land at the second entering of the nation into it, all those walled cities were consecrated. Because this taking possession in the time of Ezra, differs in no way from that in the time of Joshua. For in the time of Joshua they counted the sabbatical years and Jubilees, they consecrated the cities surrounded with walls, and paid tithes. Also at the return in the time of Ezra, they computed each seventh and fiftieth year, they consecrated walled cities, and paid tithes. The same will be done under the future third return, when all shall be gathered into the land. Then shall they begin to count the sabbatical years and Jubilees, then houses enclosed within walls shall be consecrated, &c."* The dedication of the wall of Jerusalem with trumpets and great ceremony by Nehemiah and Ezra,† in the twenty-ninth of Artaxerxes, though not a complete fulfilment of the ordinance of the Jubilee, yet is sufficient to mark the presence of the fiftieth year.

Such, then, is the outline of Scripture chronology drawn

* Maimon. de jur. Ann. Sept. et Jub. † Neh. xii. 27.

from a consideration of the sabbatical years and Jubilees, leading us with precision up to the year B.C. 982 as an epoch at which, for some reasons not expressed, the observance of the sabbatical years ought to here commenced, and for the non-observance of which the land of Judæa lay desolate for seventy years, that it might enjoy its sabbaths. By putting together also the sum of the reigns of the kings of Judah, and adding them to this period of desolation of the land, we ascertain that the epoch referred to is in fact the important æra of the completion and dedication of the temple of Solomon. This is a marked epoch in Jewish history. Up to this time, even from the entrance of the Israelites into the Holy Land, the Mosaic ritual could not have been observed in all its fulness. At the period of the dedication, however, Jerusalem became for the first time the "holy city"——the cloud descended and "the glory of the Lord filled the house"——then was the place chosen of the Lord, as foretold by Moses,* "to put his name there"† ——the tribes of Israel then began to come up to Jerusalem three times a-year, at the set feasts, to appear before the Lord——and from thenceforth, in complete fulfilment of the Mosaic institutions, the sabbatical year of rest to the land ought to have been septennially observed. The strict observance, however, of the command is not alluded to more than once throughout the Old Testament before the captivity, viz., in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, and to all appearance the non-cultivation of the land in that year was not voluntary, but constrained by the presence of the army of the Assyrians.

* Deut. xii. 5. † i. Kings viii. 29, 43, 44.

The computation of the sabbatical years, however, was preserved by the prophets; and, as we have seen, the presence of the seventh year was occasionally marked by an attempt to perform some one or more of the observances commanded in the year of release, such as reading in the ears of the people the Book of the Law, or setting the captive Hebrews free. Since the number of sabbaths to be enjoyed by the land was neither more nor less than seventy, neither more nor less than 420 years of non-observance could have preceded them. For if a longer period had elapsed than 420, the land at the end of the seventy years would still have remained defrauded of some of her sabbaths And these seventy years having ended in the beginning of the reign of Darius, seventy weeks of years, also terminated in that reign.

If, then, it be true, as I am firmly and sincerely persuaded it is true, that a second period of seventy weeks began to be reckoned from the point of completion of the first period,* in the reign of Darius—in a year expressly defined, as one in which a king bearing that title was about sixty-two years old—and that in no year about the time spoken of, except in B.C. 493, can a king called Darius, and also of the age specified, be found in history—then do the Hebrew Scriptures, I say, contain a system of chronology more clearly and precisely defined than can be found in the records of any heathen nation whatever, reaching more than 200 years higher than the earliest of the heathen æras. The Sabbatic æra is more certain and defined than the Olympic, which is said to

* *See* Haggai ii. 19. "From this day will I bless you."

begin in B.C. 776, but concerning which in the days of Plutarch no very respectful opinions were entertained. It is more accurately fixed, as regards the first year, than the æra of the building of Rome, said to be B.C. 753, but of which Niebuhr speaks as "merely an imaginary date,"* and is more strictly in unison throughout with astronomical records and calculations than the era of Nabonassar, which begins in B.C. 747, and which, as I have already shown, is at variance with the eclipse of Thales as regards the reign of the successor of Nabopalassar.

Some, however, may still be disposed, with Prideaux, to deny the use of the sabbatic period towards the settlement of Scripture chronology. I will now, therefore, set it aside for the moment, and taking the seventy weeks of Daniel, with Prideaux, as merely signifying a period of 490 years, endeavour to verify from Scripture, independently of heathen authorities, the several dates set down at the beginning of this chapter as ascertained from exclusively heathen sources.

Our starting point shall be the fifteenth year of Tiberius Cæsar, when "Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age."† The fifteenth of Tiberius began in autumn A.D. 28. And if Christ was born in Dec. B.C. 3, he would have completed his thirtieth year in Dec. A.D. 28. We are led, therefore, by Scripture to the latter part of the year B.C. 3, for the birth of the Messiah, the Most Holy. From thence we count 490 years to the first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, bringing us to year B.C 493.

From the second year of Darius we count upwards

* "Lecture on Ancient History," vol. iii. p. 169. † Luke iii. 1 -23.

of seventy years to the siege of Jerusalem, B.C. 562, by which we ascertain that the

	B.C.
Nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, when he carried away the two tribes, and burnt the Temple of Jerusalem, was	560

YEARS.

From thence, we count 10 for Zedekiah's reign
8 to the end of Jehoiakim's 4th year

18 + 560 = 578

Making the 4th year of Jehoiakim, or the 1st year of Nebuchadnezzar	578-9
And since a king of Assyria was still reigning in the last year of Josiah, and Nineveh was then standing, and in the 4th of Jehoiakim Nineveh is not mentioned in the enumeration of the kingdoms to be destroyed by the king of Babylon, Nineveh must have fallen, as usually supposed,* between the last of Josiah, and the end of the 4th of Jehoiakim, say in	579

YEARS.

We then compute 4 for Jehoiakim.
32 for Jehohahaz and Josiah.
2 for Amon.
55 for Manasses.
16 to the 14th year of Hezekiah.

109 + 578 = 687

Making the 14th of Hezekiah, when Judæa was invaded by Sennacherib, ...	687 6

From this date we compute:—

13 .	For Hezekiah
15 . .	Ahaz
16 . .	Jotham
52 . .	Uzziah
29 . .	Amaziah
40 . .	Joash
6 . .	Athaliah
1 . .	Ahaziah
8 . .	Jehoram
25 . .	Jehosophat

* *See* "Clinton's Chronology," Vol. i. p. 269.

41	. .	Asa
3	. .	Abijah
17	. .	Rehoboam
29		11th of Solomon
295+687=982		

B.C.

Making the epoch of the dedication of Solomon's Temple, and of the full establishment of the Jewish rites and ceremonies in the Holy City 982–3

And now let the reader ask himself these questions.

1st. Is it the result of coincidence, or of truth, that 490 years, counted upwards from the birth of Christ, should lead exactly to the year in which a king called Darius was sixty-two years of age?

2nd. That counting again the required number of years from the first year of Darius, so fixed, to the destruction of Jerusalem, should lead us to the year B.C. 560, the precise date of that event pointed out by a writer living 200 years before the Christian æra? 3rd. That the date of the 14th year of Hezekiah,* computed from the two previous dates, should be found to coincide within one year with the 3rd year of Sennacherib, as fixed by the chronologists of the Macedonian period? 4th. And lastly, that the time of the dedication of Solomon's temple, computed from the three previous dates, should exactly correspond with a date formed from Polybius and Josephus?

I leave to the candour and judgement of the reader to give his decisive verdict on these questions, yea, or nay.

* There is a discrepancy of one year between the sacred and profane computation, which I cannot quite explain. Possibly the invasion of Sennacherib, and then of Rabshekah, spread over the 13th and 14th of Hezekiah; the illness of Hezekiah being in the 14th.

CHAPTER VI.

It now merely remains for me to draw attention to certain difficulties involved in the foregoing arrangement of Scripture chronology, which, though not overlooked, have not been adverted to, lest the outline of the chronological arrangement should have been broken by the discussion. Difficulties of course, either apparent or real, there must be; for it is not to be supposed that the current chronology should have so long maintained its ground, amidst the many discrepancies between it and established dates which I have pointed out, unless it had been supposed that greater difficulties attended any other mode of adjustment.

I have observed that where classical and Scriptural authority are at variance, my decided inclination is to prefer the latter—that when Daniel speaks of his own master, Darius, he does not allude to Cyaxares, but to Darius the son of Hystaspes—and that Ahasuerus is undoubtedly Xerxes. It will be asked, then, how do I explain the passage which lies at the foundation of my system, Dan. ix. 1, where Darius, the son of Hystaspes according to my interpretation, is called by Daniel the son of Ahasuerus. Either, therefore, Darius is here spoken of as the son of Xerxes, which we know to be not true; or Ahasuerus signifies Hystaspes, which is contrary to what I have affirmed. What then did Daniel really intend to convey in this passage? For whatever he may have written, he could not have been

mistaken in the title of the king, considering that he was one of the principal governors over his dominions. What then did he write? This it is difficult now to determine. Of one thing, however, we may be quite certain, viz., that if Ahasuerus really signifies Xerxes, he could not have written, "Darius, son of Xerxes," as we find it in the present Hebrew.

It might be boldly affirmed that Daniel wrote originally "Darius the son of Hystaspes," and that Ahasuerus in the present copies is a corruption. This, of course would obviate all difficulty. But I do not think that the error lies in the title, because in the oldest Greek translation of the original, viz., the old Septuagint, we read:—Ἔτους πρώτου ἐπὶ Δαρείου τοῦ Ξέρξου ἀπο τῆς γενεᾶς της Μηδικῆς, ὁι εβασίλευσαν ἐπὶ την βασιλείαν τῶν χαλδάιων. Shewing that Ahasuerus=Xerxes was then in the text. The error, I think, lies in the mode of coupling the two titles, Darius and Xerxes. This translation of Daniel was made three or four hundred years before the present Hebrew text was finally settled, somewhere near the time of those learned writers to whom we have referred of the Macedonian period; and the original text from which it was taken would appear to have spoken of two kings, ὁι* εβασίλευσαν &c., viz., Xerxes, ἐπὶ Δαρέιου. And that two kings were then reigning together, we may also infer from the same Septuagint translation of the Chaldee passage, chap. v. 31, where, speaking of the same Darius, we read: Καὶ Ἀρταξέρξης ὁ των Μήδων παρελαθε την βασιλείαν, και Δαρείος πλήρης τῶν ημερῶν και ἔνδοξος εν γήρει.

* Perhaps originally ὁτι. The Hebrew word may be translated either who or when.

The original Chaldee copy, not now extant, spoke of a king, called in the translation Artaxerxes, who came to the throne when Darius was an old man. And, if we may suppose this Artaxerxes of the Greek translation from the Chaldee, to be Xerxes of the Greek translation from the Hebrew, Darius and Xerxes are spoken of as reigning together in both the passages.

Let us compare the several passages in Daniel and Ezra, &c., which speak of Darius and Ahasuerus, and consider what light this suggestion throws upon them.

DANIEL V. 31.

CHALDEE.	OLD LXX. FROM CHALDEE.
And Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about three score and two years old.	And Artaxerxes the Median took the kingdom, and Darius full of years and venerable with age.

CHAPTER IX. 1.

HEBREW.	OLD LXX. FROM HEBREW,
In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldæans.	In the first year under Darius, (son) of Xerxes, of the seed of the Medes, which kings reigned over the realm of the Chaldæans.

EZRA IV.

HEBREW.

6. And in the the reign of Ahasuerus, in the beginning of his reign, wrote they, &c.

CHALDEE.

7. And in the reign of Artaxerxes wrote Bislam, &c.

The mention of Ahasuerus, both by Josephus and in the first book of Esdras, is omitted, shewing that Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes are the same.

CHAPTER VI.

CHALDEE.

14. And they builded and finished it (the temple) according to the commandment of the God of Israel, and according to the commandment of Cyrus, and *Darius*, and *Artaxerxes, king of Persia*. And this house was finished in the third day of the month Adar, which was in the sixth year of the reign of Darius.

142002

HEBREW.

22. "For the Lord had made them joyful and turned the heart of the king of Assyria"—that is, the heart of Darius, now king over the realm of the Chaldæans.

CHAPTER VII.

HEBREW.	JOSEPHUS, xi. v. 1.
1. Now after these things in the reign of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, Ezra, the son of Seraiah——went up from Babylon.	Upon the death of Darius, Xerxes, his son, took the kingdom.—There was now in Babylon a righteous man——he was the principal priest of the people, and his name was Esdras.

ESTHER.

The events related in the Canonical book of Esther are placed in the reign of Ahasuerus=Xerxes.

The Septuagint translation places them in the reign of Artaxerxes.

There is much difficulty, it must be admitted, in reconciling these various passages as they stand with known history. The common mode of interpretation is thus, from the first four passages: the contradictions in which cannot be more complete, there being no less than five contradictions in four names.

B.C. 538 Darius, the son of Ahasuerus = Cyaxares, son of Astyages.
530 . . . Ahasuerus = Cambyses.
522 . . . Artaxerxes = Smerdis.

From the latter passages, which relate to the time of the building the temple, by the command of Darius and Artaxerxes, in the sixth year of Darius, the common mode of reconciliation is by supposing the temple to have been built by decrees running from the year

B.C. 521, second year of Darius=Darius, the son of Hystaspes

to the year

454, first of Artaxerxes=Artaxerxes Longimanus,

thus spreading the period of the building over 67 years,

in contradiction of the express words, that "this house was finished," in the sixth year of the reign of Darius."

On the other hand, the chronological arrangement which I have proposed seems to lead to the following conclusions, by means of which Scripture and profane history may be perfectly reconciled.

1st. That Ahasuerus, of the Hebrew, and Artaxerxes, of the translations, both signify the same king, Xerxes.

2nd. That Xerxes was placed on the throne of Persia by his father, Darius, when, at sixty-two years of age, he himself became king over the Chaldæans, or king of Assyria, and that all that is related concerning these kings took place within the fourteen years from B.C. 493 to 479.

Now, that Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes both signify the same king, Xerxes, we are justified in assuming, 1st. because Ahasuerus = Xerxes of the book of Esther, was translated Artaxerxes in the Septuagint; and the Targum on the book of Esther tells us, that this was the king who stopped the building of the temple for two years (called in the book of Ezra, Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes). 2nd., because Josephus tells us that Artaxerxes, in whose reign Ezra came to Jerusalem, was Xerxes=Ahasuerus. 3rd., because Ahasuerus=Xerxes in the Hebrew, Ezra iv. 6, appears to be one with Artaxerxes in the Chaldee,* v. 7. 4th., because in Daniel vi. 31, we read in the translation of the Chaldee, Artaxerxes. And in ix. 1. we read, as I think referring to the same king, in

* The book of Ezra, like the book of Daniel, has been compiled partly from a history written in Chaldee, partly from a history written in Hebrew, and the two histories appear to overlap at Ch. iv. 6, 7, making apparently two kings of one.

the Hebrew, Ahasuerus, and in the translation of the Hebrew, Xerxes.

The book of Daniel, as we now possess it, I conceive to have been compiled partly from certain writings of the prophet preserved in Hebrew at Jerusalem, and partly from certain other writings preserved in a Chaldee translation, probably amongst the dispersed beyond the Euphrates, and that wherever in the original Ahasuerus was written, it was translated Artaxerxes, either in the Chaldee or the Greek. On this hypothesis, Daniel must have written in Ch. v. 31, according to the copy translated in the old LXX. "And Ahasuerus, the Median, took the kingdom, and Darius full of years, &c.," that is, about three score and two years old, according to our present copy.

And in Ch. ix. 1. to produce consistency, we must read instead of Δαρείου τοῦ Ξέρξου, Δαρείου και Ξέρξου.

This slight alteration of κάι, for του, in the Septuagint, and of ו for יִ, in the Hebrew, appears to me to satisfy all requirements. We are quite sure, as I before observed, that Daniel did not write Darius *son* of Xerxes.

But if Daniel intended to inform us, that Ahasuerus= Xerxes came to the throne when his father Darius was growing infirm and about sixty-two years of age, that is in the year B.C. 493, it is a piece of historical information most valuable, for it enables us to explain the succession of Persian kings in the book of Ezra. It is perfectly consistent with the account in Herodotus vii. 1, 2, where he tells us that after the defeat of the Persians at the battle of Marathon, B.C. 490, all Asia was in a state of agitation for three years, and that Egypt re-

volted in the fourth, about which time Xerxes was declared successor to the throne, according to the Persian law, that the king should appoint his successor before undertaking any expedition.

And if such an appointment was required by law, during the preparations for the invasion of Greece, which ended in the battle of Salamis, it is no unreasonable assumption to suppose that Xerxes may have been before appointed governor, or king in Persia in B.C. 493, during the preparations for the invasion of Greece, which preceded the battle of Marathon.

There is a passage in Thucydides which seems to favour this opinion. For he tells us that when Themistocles fled from Athens in B.C. 471, he wrote to Artaxerxes son of Xerxes, "who was lately come to the throne." Now, if Artaxerxes Longimanus came to the throne in B.C. 472, the twenty-one years usually given to Xerxes would have commenced in B.C. 493.* Be this as it may, Daniel seems to tell us that the accession of Xerxes=Ahasuerus was in that year. When Ezra, therefore, Ch. iv. 6, writes, "And in the reign of Ahasuerus in the beginning of his reign† wrote they an accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem," and v. 24, "then ceased the work of the house of God which is at Jeru-

* This accession of Artaxerxes must have been in conjunction with Xerxes, and Xerxes must have reigned seven years more after that time.

† Dr. Hincks has observed that the expression "beginning of the reign" generally signifies that period which preceded the years counted as the year of accession. "Thus on the Nimrud Obelisk, lines 25, 26, the king first mentions a conquest which he made in the beginning of his reign (which would be styled the last year of his predecessor) and then the conquest of his first year."—Trans. Roy. Irish Academy, Vol. xxii. p. 367.

salem, so it ceased unto the second year of the reign of Darius king of Persia," he means to say that Xerxes in the beginning of B.C. 493, perhaps at the instigation of Haman (as the Targum on Esther affirms), caused the building of the temple to cease, until the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month of the second year of Darius Hystaspes, Jan. B.C. 491, when the building again went on to completion. And now, also, we can understand, how this decree that the building should cease, which according to the laws of the Medes and Persians could not be altered, came to be so easily set aside, that we find the Jews, notwithstanding it, again actively employed in the work, and the governors unable "to cause them to cease until the matter came to Darius." (Ezra v. 5.) The matter was referred to Darius no doubt as supreme, and the command of the subordinate king is not so much as even mentioned in the reference to Darius.

Again, when Ezra writes, vi. 14, that in the sixth year of Darius, B.C. 487, the temple was finished according to the commandment of Cyrus and Darius, and Artaxerxes king of Persia, how simple is the explanation when we know that in that year Darius and Xerxes were both on the throne.

Another objection may be raised, perhaps, against the foregoing arrangement from Daniel xi. 2, where in the first year of Darius, the Mede, it is said, "there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia, and the fourth," that is Xerxes, "shall be richer than they all," which, if spoken in the reign of Darius son of Hystaspes, would simply be untrue. But here again the Old LXX. confirms my view by reading ἰδοὺ τρεῖς βασιλεῖς ἀνθεστήκασιν ἐν τῇ

Περσίδι, which is the simple truth, if spoken in that reign. In fact, the Hebrew word may be read either "hitherto," or "henceforth."

Further consideration will be required before fixing the exact position of the reigns of Cyrus, and of Belshazzar. I will merely here observe, that an important result of bringing down the reign of the Cyrus of Scripture will be, to remove an anomaly in the present mode of exposition of a passage in Daniel, where the prophet, in speaking, in the third year of Cyrus, of the "Prince of the kingdom of Persia, and the "Prince of Grecia" (Javan or Ionia) is supposed to countenance the strange doctrine, that tutelary angels, presiding over the Persians and Greeks, were then contending with each other, and even thwarting the purposes of the Almighty. This exposition must, I am sure, be most unsatisfactory, even to the expositors themselves. But there is no mode of escaping from it, according to the received chronology. The distinct evidence of Daniel in the passage,—the highest possible authority in the matter—is, that in the third year of Cyrus, the supreme sovereign, there was also reigning a prince or subordinate ruler of "the kingdom of Persia," and the time spoken of appears to be shortly before the reverses experienced by Darius, soon after which the στρατηγὸς Ἑλλήνων (Old LXX.) or the the governer of Javan (Ionia), made war upon Persia, and burned Sardes. All this, however, must be the subject of consideration hereafter.

In conclusion,—If I found any favour in the eyes of my readers—if I have succeeded in removing any obstacle which may have checked their study of, or weak-

ened their reverence for the words of the sublime and holy Daniel—if I have shewn any reason for believing that historical information, as minute, and more so, than can be gathered from classical authorities may be collected from this sacred book, and from the book of Ezra, concerning the kings of Persia in the days of the captivity and restoration of the Jews from Babylon—let me crave assistance, from those who can command more leisure and ability than I can, in filling up the details of the outline of Scripture chronology which I have pointed out. Much labour, much reading, and more critical acquaintance with the sacred text than I possess, will be required to accomplish this object. That the complete adjustment of sacred and profane history will be one day effected—that profane history at this point, as at present interpreted, will be found at fault—and that the record of the holy prophet will be minutely and clearly verified—I feel as certain, as when (in no vanity is it written), from conviction solely, that the word of God cannot lie, and that the word which he had deigned to utter through his angel to the prophet, concerning the time of the appearance of the "Most Holy" here on earth, could not but literally have been fulfilled, I ventured, in the face of the highest authority, to declare that science was at fault, and that the date of that eclipse which bears so important a part in fixing the chronology of Scripture, and which in fact was the main obstacle in the way of a solution of the difficulty, would sooner or later be proved to have been erroneously calculated.

My pains and labour in this instance have been rewarded. But there is still an earthly reward which I

covet with my whole heart, viz., that I may be the means of removing, if even partially, the veil which now separates Christian and Hebrew brethren from each other —that I may induce my Hebrew brethren to give more earnest heed to the words of that prophet who has spoken to them concerning the "Son of Man," and who has specially foreshadowed the destinies of his chosen people. Theirs, indeed, is the appointed task which I have been imperfectly endeavouring to perform. It is their part, and their duty, to vindicate the honour of that sacred book which has been committed to their charge, and which in these days has been blasphemed. Would that I could rouse the Israelite to a sense of the dignity of his charge: —would that I could wake the dormant energy of this chosen generation—this royal priesthood—this holy nation—this peculiar people, and that with their deep knowledge of the sacred text—their experience of the meaning of oriental terms—they would roll back the tide of criticism upon these modern heathen commentators. Is there no David midst all the host of Israel, who will stand up and defy these enemies of his word, in the name of the living God? Is not this their appointed duty? Was it not for this that they were chosen out of the nations of the whole earth? Not merely to preserve the sacred volume from corruption, a part which they have most faithfully performed, but to spread the truth of the word to the uttermost part of the earth. To be in fact the salt of the earth. Alas, for how many centuries the salt has lost it savour. "For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon the earth, and ask from the one side

of heaven unto the other, whether there has been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it? Did ever people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard?" To what nation under heaven, except to this chosen nation, did the Holy One of Israel deign to manifest himself in person at the appointed time, though they knew him not? To what nation under heaven, has he declared that he will manifest himself again, except to this nation, when he will "pour upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and supplication"—when "there shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, who shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant with them when I shall take away their sins."

And now what hindereth the union of Hebrews and Christians in running the same course? Are we not both waiting and looking for the same Deliverer? Do not Christians as well as Jews believe, that when he shall appear, Israel shall again resume her spiritual pre-eminence over the nations of the earth? Has it not been said by the Christian apostle, "if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?"

I have before me a Jewish Catechism, in which the 12th article of belief runs thus:—"That the Almighty God will send a Messias to redeem his people, and that though you should meet with delays, nevertheless expect him. This Messias shall be of the offspring of David, a branch of the root of Jesse the Bethlemite. He shall establish justice on the earth, and judge many nations;

righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, he shall see his seed and prolong his days over his kingdom; and there will be no other difference between the present state of the world, and what it shall be at the time of the Messiah's coming. But that the kingdom, as it was originally, shall return to the people of Israel, and they shall inhabit their own land, build their temple, and offer sacrifices as they did in their primitive station: the priests shall attend their service, and the Levites glorify God in their hymns. The ten tribes carried into captivity by the king of Assyria, and not since known or heard of, shall again be discovered, and joined to the tribes of Judah and Benjamin."

There is little in this article which a Christian may not believe. There is little in it which I and many do not profess to believe. And why? Because we believe that the Jews more truly interpret the words of the prophets than those who venture to do away with the direct meaning of expressions by what they call spiritual interpretations. Moreover, "I surely believe," with the pious Tobit, "those things which Jonas the prophet spake of Nineveh, that it shall be overthrown: and that for a time peace shall rather be in Media: and that our brethren shall be scattered in the earth from that good land: and Jerusalem shall be desolate, and the house of God in it shall be burned, and shall be desolate for a time. And that again God will have mercy on them, and bring them again into the land, where they shall build a temple, but not like to the first, until the time of that age be fulfilled: and afterward they shall return from all places of their captivity, and build up Jerusalem gloriously, and

the house of God shall be built in it for ever, with a glorious building, as the prophets have spoken thereof." —Tobit, xiv 4, 5.

Now "the time of that age" is nearly fulfilled. The time for Israel's redemption is surely near at hand. Who that studies that sacred book, of which it is written, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy,"* does not feel, that two of the heavy "Woes" predicted upon corrupt and idolatrous Christianity, have nearly, if not quite been fulfilled? Who that deigns to examine, can fail to perceive in the symbolical portrait, depicted under the "second woe," the features of that tottering Eastern nation—the scourge of Christianity for nearly four hundred years—which is now hastening to its fall? And when that power shall have ceased to tyrannize over "the third part of men," what are we told shall follow?

"The second Woe is past: and behold the third cometh quickly. And the seventh angel sounded and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Messias, and he shall reign for ever and ever."†

* Rev. 1. 3.

† Rev. xi. 14, 15.

APPENDIX.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR OF THE "ATHENÆUM" PUBLISHED IN 1851 AND 1852.

Claysmore, Enfield.

The communication of Colonel Rawlinson to your paper of the 23rd of August is one of the deepest interest to those who are engaged in the study of Scripture and profane chronology. Will you allow me, therefore, through your medium to offer some suggestions to the Colonel and those occupied in deciphering the annals of the Assyrian kings with regard to the chronology of the period; and also to direct their attention to one or two points which they have the means at once of verifying or the contrary?

The current Scripture chronology of the reign of Hezekiah, which governs that of Shalmanezer and Sennacherib, appears to me highly defective; inasmuch as that reign, which is placed between the years B.C. 726 and 698, stands eighteen years above the first year of Asaradin, king of Babylon, of the Canon of Ptolemy, B.C. 680. For, this last king can be no other than the Esarhaddon of Scripture, and the Asordanes of Polyhistor; and Polyhistor relates that Sennacherib placed him on the throne of Babylon during his reign in Assyria. The reign of Hezekiah ought therefore to be found in part concurrent with that of Ptolemy's Asaradin. Mr. Clinton in his "Chronology" —and Sir Henry Ellis in his edition of Blair's "Tables"— have been compelled therefore to substitute the Asordanes of Polyhistor for the Apronadius of the Canon B.C. 699:—

for which there is no warrant, and which is clearly contrary to the meaning of Polyhistor's record.

If we will consent to accept the evidence ef Polyhistor as it is written (preserved by Eusebius, though rejected by him), and also the evidence of another independent writer of the third century before Christ, preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. 1, viz., Demetrius the Jew, —the whole chronology of the period becomes plain and consistent.

Eusebius remarks, that Polyhistor places the first year of Sennacherib 88 years before the reign of the successor of Nabopalassar. Now, here we have a fixed point to start from. For the years of the reign of Nabopalassar are certified by an eclipse observed at Babylon in his fifth year; and adding 88 years to the last year of his reign B.C. 605, brings us to B.C. 693 for the first year of Sennacherib.

Polyhistor gives 18 years to Sennacherib, and 8 to his son, who we know was Esarhaddon. So that Esarhaddon ceased to reign in the year B.C. 668,—the very year of the death of Asaradin of the Canon at Babylon. The correctness of Polyhistor's statement is thus strongly confirmed.

Again,—Demetrius the Jew informs us (and whose authority could be better?) that the Ten Tribes were carried away 473 years and 9 months before the reign of Ptolomy Philopater—that is 473 years 9 months + 221 years 2 months = 694 years 11 months = Feb. B.C. 695:— which fixes the sixth year of the reign of Hezekiah, in which Samaria was taken by Shalmanezer, to the second year before Sennacherib came to the throne of Nineveh. Thus is Colonel Rawlinson's suggestion of a second invasion of Palestine towards the end of the reign of Shal-

manezer confirmed. As the records of this king at Khorsabad extend to his fifteenth year, and Samaria was besieged by him for three whole years, his reign must have lasted not less than 18 years. If we say 19 years, the first of Shalmanezer will fall in B.C. 712, which is the last year of the reign of Pekah, king of Israel :—which throws light on a passage in Isaiah not before interpreted. For the inscriptions relate that Shalmanezer in his first year (B.C. 712) came against Samaria; and Isaiah, writing while Ahas and Pekah were both reigning,—that is, between B.C. 715 and 712,—predicts that before his son shall be able to cry "my father and my mother,"—that is, before two years shall have expired,—"the spoil of Samaria shall be taken,"—Isaiah, viii. 4. The predicted invasion is that recorded at Khorsabad, when 27,000 families and upwards were carried away.

Now, the questions I would ask are :—

1st. Do the inscriptions bear out the suggestion that Pekah, and not Hosea, was the captive on this invasion?

2nd. Do they confirm the statement of Polyhistor, that Sennacherib during his reign over Assyria placed his son Esarhaddon on the throne of Babylon?

If these points are confirmed, I feel no doubt of the correctness of the inclosed table of the chronology* of that period; and I shall hereafter take the liberty of communicating the interesting results, as regards Scripture chronology between this period and the birth of Christ, which necessarily flow from it.

I am, &c.

Athenæum, Sept. 13, 1851. J. W. BOSANQUET.

* The chronological tables are omitted as unnecessary.

Claysmore, Enfield.

Since my last communication, I have met with what appears to me a striking confirmation of my view of the chronology of the Assyrian kings. Colonel Rawlinson states, from the inscriptions at Koyunjik, that Sennacherib, in his third year, "undertook an expedition against Lulyia, king of Sidon (the Ἐλουλαῖος of Meander), in which he was completely successful." Now, in Theon's copy of the Astronomical Canon, we find that a king called Ἰλουλαῖος began to reign in the twenty-sixth year of the æra of Nabonassar,—B.C. 726; and Josephus tells us, ix. 14, that amongst the Archives of Tyre there was an account of an expedition of Shalmanezer against Ἐλουλαῖος, king of Tyre, which was successfully resisted for five years,—and that he reigned thirty-six years. He was conquered, it appears, by Sennacherib, in that king's third year; and Sennacherib's third I assume to be concurrent with the last year of the king of Tyre. But if the first year of Ἐλουλαῖος of Babylon was B.C. 726, his thirty-sixth year was (supposing him also to have been the king of Tyre) B.C. 691, which is the third year of Sennacherib in my table:—thus exactly coinciding with the date given by Polyhistor, and confirmed by Demetrius.

Allow me to mention here, that in a work on Chronology published by me in 1848, I had considered that the dates of Demetrius should be counted from Philopator, as king of Judæa. I now see that they count from his reign in Egypt, which throws all my dates about five years higher. Your correspondent J. G. asks—"How could Merodach-Baladan, the son of Baladan, be in a

position to send an embassy to an enemy of Sennacherib near about the third year of the latter king's reign, if, as the inscription informs us, the Babylonians under Merodach-Baladan, their king, were subjugated by Sennacherib at the very commencement of his reign?" If J. G. will turn to a fragment of Polyhistor, in the Armenian copy of Eusebius, he will find that Merodach-Baladan forcibly obtained possession of the throne of Babylon for six months in the fourth or fifth year preceding the accession of Asordanes, or Asaradin of the Canon,—that is, in the year B.C. 684 or 685, which years are concurrent with the seventeenth and sixteenth of Hezekiah in the table. In the beginning of the fifteenth year of Hezekiah the astronomical wonder took place at Jerusalem; and in the sixteenth and seventeenth of his reign the Chaldean astronomers, through the princes of Babylon, sent to inquire concerning it. If I may venture to question any assertion of Colonel Rawlinson, I would ask, whether it is not Baladan, the father, not Merodach-Baladan, the son, who is conquered in the first year of Sennacherib? For, we find that Regibel, or Regibal, ceased to reign at Babylon in that year; and this king—his last title, Adan, having been omitted—I take to be the Rege-Bal-Adan in question.

The great obstacle in the way of the reception of this alteration of our current Scripture chronology is, the received date for the eclipse of Thales, B.C. 610. For, the revolt of the Medes under Deioces took place about the third or fourth year of Sennacherib, as we collect from a contemporary writing, the Book of Tobit, and from Josephus x. 2. But if Deioces reigned fifty-three years, and

Phraortes or Arphaxad (who was conquered in the twelfth year of Nabopalassar) reigned twenty-two, the reign of Cyaxares, king of Media, did not commence till the year B.C. 613. So that, the battle between Cyaxares and Alyattes during which the eclipse took place, in the sixth year of the war between those kings, would fall, according to this reckoning, later than the current date of the eclipse. The current date, it may be observed, by the way, falls before the accession of Alyattes, king of Lydia, B.C. 605, according to the Parian Chronicle:—which is as great a difficulty in the common chronology.

Now, Ideler has pronounced, on the authority of Oltmann, the German astronomer, that the eclipse of B.C. 610 is that of Thales; and he adds, "thus are so many chronological systems founded on this eclipse reduced to nothingness by Herr Oltmann's valuable calculation." The historical date of the eclipse is the 48th or 49th Olympiad, which points to the eclipse of May, B.C. 585, which is that adopted by Sir I. Newton and Kepler Ideler sets this eclipse aside,—"the greatest obscuration," he says, "having taken place half an hour *before sunrise*, and being only seven and half digits in long. 36°, lat. 40°," where he places the battle.

Ideler, however, has mistaken sunrise for sunset, as has been pointed out to me by the Rev. J. M. Heath, and may be seen by comparing Oltmann's calculation with that of our eminent astronomer Baily (*see* "Phil. Trans. 1811), who, speaking of the eclipse of B.C. 585, says: "By a trigonometrical calculation I have ascertained that the sun set centrally eclipsed on the borders of the Red Sea in lat. N. 28° 1′ and E. long. 35° 2′." Mr. Baily adds,

speaking of Laplace's formulæ, by which he calculated: "It is with much deference that I presume to question the accuracy of the results obtained by means of these formulæ." But on testing their accuracy by applying them to a certain eclipse in B.C. 310, the track of the shadow of which is known from history, he finds that the calculation places the moon's shadow 3° too far to south. Mr. Baily then observes, that if a correction to the extent of 3° were applied to the eclipse of B.C. 610, "the path of the moon's umbra might be thrown so far north as to prevent that eclipse being total in any part of Asia Minor,"—and so, he might have added, excluding it from possibly being that of Thales, Nevertheless, Mr. Baily decides in favour of the eclipse of B.C. 610. I submit that his reasoning is inconclusive. For, he assumes that the battle took place near the river Halys, for which there is no authority.

Now, the defect in Laplace's formulæ, which in B.C. 310 would produce an error of 3°, would I presume in B.C. 585 produce a still greater error, so that the moon's umbra at that date may have been thrown as high as lat. 34° or 35°; and the correction of the error which would thus throw out the eclipse of B.C. 610 would have the effect of throwing in that of B.C. 585, provided we may place the battle in a lower latitude. The account of Herodotus appears to point out the place of the battle as somewhere on the line between the territories of the kings of Babylon and Cilicia,—for we find that the kings of both those countries were present, and there also was the beaten track between Media and Lydia. The battle, therefore, probably took place south of lat. 36°. The eclipse, I submit with deference, may have been total above lat. 34°.

It would be doing a great service to science if our great astronomers would undertake to settle this most important question. It appears to me well worthy of any labour which may be bestowed on it. Perhaps it might assist the investigation, if the formulæ of Laplace were tested upon the eclipse mentioned by Thucydides ii. 28, at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, where the sun is described as having formed a crescent, and which fell in the year B.C., August, 431.

I subjoin a more complete table of chronology.

I am, &c.,

Athenæum, Sept 20, 1851. J. W. BOSANQUET.

Claysmore, Enfield.

In my letter which appeared in your paper of the 20th of September, I called attention to the calculations of Oltmann and Baily with regard to the date of the famous eclipse of Thales, determined by both those astronomers to be that of the year B.C. 610. And I ventured to surmise, partly from some remarks made by Mr. Baily, partly from the obvious necessity of lowering the latitude of the generally assumed locality of the battle between the Lydians and Medes during which the eclipse took place, that the historical date of that event, B.C. 585, would ultimately prove to be the true one.

I am since informed, by the kindness of Professor Airy, the Astronomer Royal, that the reduction of the Greenwich lunar observations from 1750 to 1830, made under his care, "shew, as a fact of observation, that the tabular motion of the moon's node is erroneous by more than a

minute of arc in a century; and that probably in the time of Thales the place of the moon's node differed twenty-seven minutes from that used by Baily, which would make a difference of 200 miles or more, according to the tables used by that astronomer, in the line of the shadow's path, sometimes throwing it to the North, sometimes to the South, according as the eclipse happened in the ascending or descending node." From the previous observations of astronomers it may be proved, that the total shadow of the eclipse of B.C. 610 will, by Mr. Airy's discoveries, be thrown further North, and therefore entirely out of Asia Minor. Mr. Airy's valuable tables of corrections of the elements of the moon's orbit, published in 1848, will I trust ere long lead to a decision of the important question in chronology, viz., which is the true date of the eclipse predicted by the Grecian philosopher?

Pending the solution of this interesting question, I submit for consideration a chronological table of the times of the destruction of Nineveh, framed in accordance with the historical date of the eclipse, and in strict conformity with the evidence of the earliest historians who have written of those times. It may be thought interesting as shewing the bearing of the eclipse of Thales on the chronology of the times. It is my sanguine expectation, also, that it will prove to be the true explanation of the chronology of the period of the capture of the great city of the Assyrian empire.

The confusion of titles and contradictions of authority under the present arrangement of dates must, I am sure, be unsatisfactory to every one who has examined into the subject. The very learned work of Mr. Clinton and Hale's

"Chronology" afford ample proof of this assertion. Without dwelling on the anachronisms and contradictions to which I allude, which would lead me into too great a length, I will at once state the grounds of the arrangement which I propose. And first, let us accurately define the dates of the two reigns of Nabopalassar and Nebuchadnezzar his son.

We have already ascertained, on the authority of Demetrius, as shewn in my letter which appeared in your paper of the 13th of September, that the sixth year of the reign of Hezekiah, king of Judah, was the year B.C. 695. Hezekiah reigned 23 years after that time; Manasses 55 years; Amon 2 years; Josiah 32 years, including Jehohahaz; Jehoiakim 11 years; Jechoniah 1 year; and Zedekiah 11 years: making together 135 years. Jerusalem was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, and deducting 135 years from 695, leaves the year B.C. 560 as that of the Destruction of Jerusalem. Now, Demetrius records that from the time when the two tribes were carried away captive from Jerusalem to the reign of the fourth Ptolemy—viz., Philopator—was exactly 338 years and 3 months—that is, 338 years 3 months + B.C. 221 years 2 months = 559 years 5 months = August, B.C. 560. The precision of this date is very remarkable, and I submit should not be lightly disregarded.

But Jerusalem was destroyed in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, 2 Kings, xxv. 8. So that, we thus define the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar to be B.C. 560 and his first year, therefore, B.C. 578.

Let us now fix the date of the reign of Nabopalassar,

who was father to Nebuchadnezzar. For, Colonel Rawlinson states, "I have examined the bricks, *in situ*, belonging perhaps to one hundred different towns and cities"—(in Babylonia)—"and I never found any other legend than Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabopalassar."—Journal of Asiatic Society, Vol. xii. Part 2. Fortunately, the date of this reign is fixed with astronomical precision. For, in the Almagest of Ptolemy, ch. V. 14, there is mention made of an eclipse of the moon, observed at Babylon, in the fifth year of the reign of Nabopalassar, in the 127th year of the æra of Nabonassar, with the exact day and hour of the event. This eclipse happened in the year B.C. 621, so that the first year of Nabopalassar must have been B.C. 625; and, allowing twenty years for his reign at Nineveh, according to Polyhistor, his last year was B.C. 606.

We find, then, that an interval of twenty-eight years elapsed between the last year of Nabopalassar on the throne of Nineveh and the first year of Nebuchadnezzar B.C. 578 as king of Babylon. It is the discovery of this interval which enables us, I submit, to reconcile the apparently conflicting accounts of the several histories of this period.

Polyhistor informs us that Nabopalassar was Sardanapalus. Whether he really bore this title, or whether it has been erroneously given to him as the king who was ejected from the great palace of Sardanapalus, we have the authority of Polyhistor for the fact that Nabopalassar was so called, and, therefore, that he considered him as the last of the Assyrian kings of Nineveh. For, according to all history, a king commonly called Sardanapalus was

the last of the Assyrian dynasty. Herodotus, Ctesias, Diodorus all testify that the Medes subverted the throne of Nineveh; and Herodotus adds, with great exactness, that when Cyaxares, the king of Media, had overthrown that king of Assyria who slew his father Phraortes (the Arphaxad of the book of Judith), he himself was immediately overthrown by a sudden irruption of Scythians, who possessed themselves of the empire of Asia for twenty-eight years. Cyaxares therefore conquered Nabopalassar (the Nebuchodonosor of the book of Judith who slew Arphaxad) in the year B.C. 606, the last year of the reign of Nabopalassar in Nineveh. From thence we must count the twenty-eight years of Scythian domination, which must also have terminated when the father of Nebuchadnezzar "obtained the daughter of Astyages the prince of the Medes to be affianced to his son" (called Nabuchodrossorus), "and marched straightways to surprise the city of Ninus, that is Nineveh. When Saracus the king was apprised of these proceedings he burned the royal palace, *and Nabuchodrossorus succeeded to the empire*, and surrounded Babylon with a strong wall."—*See* Abydenus, "Cory's Fragments," p. 64. Who can doubt that these twenty-eight years of Scythian domination form the interval of twenty-eight years above pointed out between the twentieth year of Nabopalassar and the beginning of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar in Babylon?

That some interval elapsed between the fall of the king called Sardanapalus and the final overthrow of Nineveh, is confirmed by Abydenus and Castor the Rhodian chronologist. Abydenus writes:—"after him (Sardanapalus), Saracus reigned over the Assyrians." Castor writes:—

"Ninus obtained the empire after Sardanapalus."—"Cory's Fragments," p. 65. He is in error, however, as to the name of the king:—copying probably from some history which relates the fall of the city of Ninus, *i. e.*, Nineveh.

Saracus then was the Scythian king. And now we can comprehend, without charging the historians with contradiction of each other, how, as Polyhistor relates, Sardanapalus (Nabopalassar) formed an alliance with the Medes for his son Nabuchodrossorus, who then began to reign; and how, as Abydenus relates, Saracus succeeded Sardanapalus, and yet how the father of Nebuchadnezzar conquered that Saracus; and how again, as Berosus relates, Nebuchadnezzar succeeded his father Nabopalassar after the latter had reigned twenty-nine years. Polyhistor says, that he reigned twenty-nine years in Nineveh. He also in another place gives him twenty-one years, which I take to be the length of his reign in Babylon. Saracus, it appears from Abydenus, replaced him in power at Babylon, on hearing that a great multitude from the sea coast was coming to attack him; and thus, it is not unreasonable to assume that he added eight more years to his reign over that city. That he was so replaced, and for about so many years, we may infer from Herodotus; who, in the year of the eclipse, B.C. 585, *seven years* before the accession of his son, speaks of him as "Labynetus of Babylon," and as negotiating a treaty of peace between the Lydians and Medes in conjunction with the king of Cilicia. He was then ruler or king of Babylon seven or eight years before Nebuchadnezzar began to reign.

Thus, the accounts of Herodotus, Ctesias, Berosus, Poly-

histor, Demetrius, Castor, and Diodorus mutually confirm and strengthen each other. They are also in harmony with the contemporary writer of the book of Tobit, who affirms that Nineveh was captured by Nabuchodonosor and Ahasuerus; that is, by an alliance of Medes and Babylonians under Nabopalassar and Cyaxares.

And now, let us observe how the chronology, thus adjusted, harmonizes with the historical date of the eclipse of Thales,—and how completely it is at variance with the assumed date of that event, B.C. 610.

The war between Alyattes, king of Lydia, and Cyaxares, king of Media, which arose out of a dispute concerning certain Scythian fugitives, could not have taken place till after "the Scythians had found their way into Asia, and arrived at the territories of the Medes,"—Herodotus, i. 103,—that is to say, till after the year B.C. 606 in our arrangement. Nor could it have taken place later than the expiration of the twenty-eight years of Scythian rule, because Nineveh was finally destroyed after the close of that war,—Herodotus, i. 106,—that is, before B.C. 579. Between these dates, therefore, we look for the war marked by the eclipse in the sixth year. And, accordingly, Eudemus, Pliny, Cicero, and Solinus, without any contradiction, all point to about the year B.C. 585 as the date of the eclipse. Diogenes Laertius also remarks, that Anacharsis, a Scythian prince and philosopher, visited Athens in the 47th Olympiad = B.C. 592, which falls within the twenty-eight years of Scythian dominion. Alyattes, king of Lydia, according to the Parian Chronicle, began to reign in the year B.C. 605, within the twenty-eight

years according to our arrangement, but five years after the eclipse if placed in B.C. 610. It is unnecessary, I think, to point out in detail the entire dislocation of all these dates and records which results from placing the eclipse in that year.

The interesting question yet remains—"How are these conclusions confirmed, or otherwise, by the inscriptions which have been recovered from the neighbourhood of Nineveh? And here, I regret to say, we are at present left entirely in the dark. Colonel Rawlinson has, indeed, with wonderful skill and perseverance, recovered the names of Shalmanezer, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon. The names of their successors, however, at Nineveh, who reigned towards the times of which we have been treating, remain yet to be identified. According to Abydenus, Nergillus (Nergal) followed Sennacherib on the throne of Nineveh. Nergal may, like Sargon, the title of Shalmanezer, have been another title of Esarhaddon. Adramelec appears to have succeeded Nergal; and after Adramelec came his brother Axerdis, or Acsharedis, who I take to be Sharezar. Then followed Nabopalassar, or Sardanapalus, under whom the Assyrian monarchy ceased These titles, then, if Abydenus is to be depended on, ought to be found on the Assyrian monuments.

I inclose a Table of the Chronology.

I am, &c.

J. W. BOSANQUET.

Athenæum, Oct. 21, 1851.

THE ECLIPSE OF THALES.

Claysmore, Enfield.

While astronomers are engaged in correcting and perfecting their theory of the motions of the moon's node, the result of which will, I trust, be ere long to decide the question which is the true date of the eclipse said to have been predicted by Thales,—an investigation which I have every reason to believe is in the hands of more than one able inquirer,—allow me to offer some observations, drawn from history, tending to shew how highly improbable it is that the eclipse of the year B.C. 610, which has been so positively fixed upon by Ideler and other chronologists, can be that which was foretold by the Miletian philosopher. Your readers are aware that the eclipse which Thales computed was made memorable by the fact, that it caused the suspension of a battle between the armies of Cyaxares, king of Media, and Alyattes, king of Lydia, in the *sixth* year of a war between those two kings. To be consistent, therefore, with history, it is indispensable that the eclipse selected should be found to fall in some year not earlier than the sixth year of the reign of Alyattes. Let us inquire what evidence remains with regard to the date of the accession of that king to the throne.

The earliest authority that we meet with is very distinct on this point, and is also an authority of great weight, viz., the Parian Chronicle, compiled within 300 years after the death of Alyattes. This Chronicle places the first year of the reign of Alyattes in the year B.C. 605. Now, if this date is correct, it is unnecessary to pursue

the inquiry any further, for it is conclusive against the eclipse of the year B.C. 610. The correctness of the date, however, is not relied upon by modern chronologists. We have to inquire, therefore, how far it is confirmed by other ancient authority.

There are three ancient authorities which appear to me to support the record of the marble. Sosicrates, quoted by Diogenes Laertius (life of Periander), tells us that "Periander died forty-one years before Crœsus (and), before the 49th Olympiad." "Before Crœsus," I take to mean before the time of Crœsus, not "before the overthrow of Crœsus," as Mr. Clinton would assume. And "before the 49th Olympiad," signifies somewhere in the 48th, which runs from B.C. 588 to 585. Now, supposing Periander to have died in the B.C. 587, the 41st year from that date inclusive would be B.C. 547, for the accession of Crœsus, and Alyattes having reigned fifty-seven whole years, and say three months, before the accession of Crœsus, would bring us to the year B.C. $547+57{\cdot}3^{m}$ $6=04{\cdot}3^{m}$, or B.C. 605, for the accession of Alyattes, being the exact year given on the marble. The words of Sosicrates are not very precise, but are thus quite consistent with the Parian Chronicle. Euphorion, quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. I.), states that Gyges, king of Lydia, began to reign in the 18th Olympiad=B.C. 708—5. It is not defined in which of the four years that composed this Olympiad his accession to the throne took place. Counting, however, from the last year of the Olympiad, thirty-eight years for the reign of Gyges, forty-nine years for the reign of Ardys, and twelve years for the reign of Sadyattes, we come to the year B.C. 606

as that of the accession of Alyattes,—that is to say, within one year of the date recorded on the marble. Again, Pliny records that Candaules, the predecessor of Gyges, died in the 18th Olympiad, which leads to the same conclusion. Up to the time of Pliny, therefore, we may assume that there was no doubt, within the limits of one Olympiad, as regards the date of the accession of Alyattes to the throne.

It may be remarked, with reference to the Parian Chronicle, that the dates therein recorded are not, like the dates of historians, liable to alteration by the carelessness or incompetence of copyists. Whatever was the opinion of the compiler—which probably was the received opinion of his day—we have it now before us. It is true that in the time of Selden, who deciphered the engraving on the marble, the remains were much mutilated by time. Nevertheless, sufficient traces of the inscription remained, even in the opinion of those who reject the date (see both Hales' and Prideaux's copies of the Chronicle), from which to deduce the year B.C. 605 as that of the accession of Alyattes. The compiler, then, it must be supposed by those who reject the authority of the marble, was mistaken in his opinion. Yet surely the best sources of information were then open to him. The island of Paros was not far distant from Lydia, where the chronology of the times of the kings of Lydia was capable probably of being verified. For we must remember that the tombs of the Lydian kings, which were visited by Herodotus, and afterwards by Strabo, and more especially the tomb of Alyattes, which is spoken of by Herodotus as a work of art second to none but the

monuments of the Egyptians and Babylonians (L. I. 93), were open to inspection in the time of the compiler of the Chronicle, about the year B.C. 264, and it is not unreasonable to assume that there were inscriptions on those monuments recording events and dates connected with the reigns of the kings they were intended to commemorate. The monument of Alyattes is still visible near the site of ancient Sardis; though in 1825 its stone basement, as Chandler reports, was covered by the mould which had been washed down from above. It is not impossible that the annals of the reign of Alyattes might yet be recovered on clearing away the rubbish which envelopes his tomb.

Let us next refer to the authority of Eusebius, who wrote in the fourth century after Christ. Eusebius (*see* Armenian copy), who has taken upon himself to strike off eight years of the reign of Alyattes, places the time of his accession to the throne in the year B.C. 610, five years higher than the Parian Chronicle. But whether the true date be B.C. 610, with Eusebius, or B.C. 605, with the Chronicle, either is conclusive against the possibility of the eclipse having taken place in the year B.C. 610.

Modern chronologists have raised the date of the first of Alyattes to B.C. 617. But even this date will not allow of the eclipse having happened in B.C. 610, consistently with history. For thus it would have fallen in the eighth year of the king's reign. Now Herodotus tells us that the first six years of Alyattes were occupied in war against the Miletians. There is not the slightest intimation that the war with the Medes was carried on at the same time as that against Miletus. And if they

were carried on separately, it is clear, since each war occupied six years, that the eclipse cannot be placed earlier than the twelfth year of the reign. I will not dwell upon the fact that Alyattes had a daughter at the time of the eclipse old enough to be married to Astyages, and yet lived at least till the year B.C. 560. But passing over this, and also the youth of Thales at the time he made his computation, if in the year B.C. 610, I think I have sufficiently shewn how highly improbable it is that the eclipse of that year could have been that predicted by Thales. And I venture to uphold the general accuracy and consistency of history on this point, in opposition to the results hitherto derived from astronomy; considering how confessedly imperfect have been the lunar tables upon which astronomers have founded their calculations.

I am, &c.,

Athenæum, Dec. 6, 1851. J. W. BOSANQUET.

Claysmore, Enfield.

In my communications to your papers of the 13th and 20th of September, and the 25th of October last, I endeavoured to establish two points in Biblical Chronology. First, that the sixth year of Hezekiah, king of Judah, in which the ten tribes of Israel were carried away captive by Shalmanezer, king of Assyria, was the year B.C. 695—not B.C. 721, as is usually supposed; second, that Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar, and the two tribes carried away, in the nineteenth year of his reign,

in August, B.C. 560—not in B.C. 588, as is usually supposed.

These two fundamental dates, in my arrangement, it will be remembered, are expressly recorded by Demetrius, the Jewish writer, who lived in the time of Ptolemy Philopator, and who states that the ten tribes were carried away 473 years and nine months before the reign of Philopator, and the two tribes 338 years and three months before the same date, this fourth Ptolemy having come to the throne about November, B.C. 222.

Sennacherib, king of Assyria, we know, was contemporary with Hezekiah, king of Judah, and by fixing the period of his reign, we confirmed our view of the time of Hezekiah. The reign of Sennacherib was fixed, first by counting upwards, on the authority of Polyhistor, eighty-eight years from the end of the reign of Nabopalassar, whose years are astronomically fixed in Ptolemy's Canon, that is, from B.C. 606+88=B.C. 693, which makes the first year of Sennacherib B.C. 693; second, by counting downwards, from the first year of Ilulæus, king of Babylon, whose first year is also as precisely fixed as the year of Nabopalassar. Now, the first of Ilulæus is B.C. 726, and he reigned, according to Josephus, thirty-six years; and, according to the inscription at Koyunjik, Lulyia, or Ilulæus, king of Sidon, was conquered by Sennacherib in that king's third year; and thirty-six years counted from B.C. 726 brings us to the year B.C. 691 for the third year of Sennacherib, which agrees with Polyhistor's reckoning, who makes his first year B.C. 693.

Again, it was shewn, that the date of the reign of

Asaradin, king of Babylon, the Esarhaddon of Scripture, and also the date of Merodach-Baladan, who "sent letters and a present to Hezekiah" (Isaiah xxxix. 1.), and who preceded Asaradin about four years, according to Polyhistor, both of which dates are immoveably fixed in Ptolemy's Canon, harmonize with the years of Hezekiah's reign, as above determined. An inference also drawn by me from this arrangement of the chronology, viz., that the 27,280 families carried away from Samaria, as recorded in an inscription at Khorsabad, must have been carried away in the reign of Pekah, king of Israel, not in the reign of Hosea, has since been confirmed by Dr. Hincks, in one of your late numbers, though it is still a question between Dr. Hincks and Colonel Rawlinson whether the then king of Assyria was Tiglath-Pileser or Shalmanezer. My proposed arrangement of the chronology, indeed, produces such complete consistency between Scripture, ancient heathen authorities, and the inscriptions lately discovered about the site of Nineveh, that there is hardly room for doubt that the first of the above dates, viz., B.C. 695, for the sixth of Hezekiah, is now clearly established.

The second date, viz., that of the carrying away of the two tribes and the destruction of Jerusalem, in the year B.C. 560, may probably not meet with such ready acquiescence. Some who have felt the necessity of lowering the reign of Hezekiah,—for instance, Dr. Hincks, in his learned treatise on the Khorsabad inscriptions, p. 55—rather than lower the received date of the capture of Jerusalem, have proposed to deduct twenty years from the long reign of Manasseh, king of Judah. This view,

however, is inconsistent with the contents of Ezekiel iv., where the period between the reign of Jeroboam and the fall of Jerusalem is determined. Considering, also, the direct testimony of Demetrius, that B.C. 560 was the date —that Demetrius lived at a time when the true date could have been easily ascertained—that the date in question plainly results from adding the sum of the reigns of the latter kings of Judah, as contained in the Hebrew text, to the years of Hezekiah, as fixed in a previous letter (proving, by the way, that the text is the same now as in the time of Demetrius)—and that by lowering, as a necessary consequence, the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, passages in Abydenus, Polyhistor, and Herodotus are reconciled, which before were at variance and unintelligible,—I have the same conviction in my own mind that the year B.C. 560 is the true date of the capture of Jerusalem, as I have that Samaria was captured in B.C. 695.

Much, as I have before observed, depends upon the year which shall be finally determined to be that of the eclipse of Thales. If, in direct contradiction of all ancient authority, it shall be decided that the currently received date, B.C. 610, is the true date of that eclipse, then may the final overthrow of Nineveh, immediately after which Nebuchadnezzar came to the throne (Abydenus, in Arm. Chron. p. 53), have been accomplished in B.C. 606, as usually supposed, and my date for the nineteenth of Nebuchadnezzar must be incorrect. If, however, as I anticipate, the historical date of the eclipse, viz., B.C. 585, or some year close upon that date, shall be confirmed, then must the fall of Nineveh and the accession of Nebu-

chadnezzar have taken place somewhat later than the year B.C. 585, and an irresistible weight of testimony, converging upon the year B.C. 560, whether computed from above, as we have seen, or from the birth of Christ, as I shall presently shew, will determine that year to be the nineteenth of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar.

Taking my stand, then, for the present, upon history, until its records shall have been clearly confirmed, or otherwise, by the accurate test of astronomy, and assuming the above two chronological points as determined, I now proceed to examine the following interesting chain of dates which necessarily flow from them, and which, however startling they may appear, I believe to be most important truths in chronology :—

From the capture of Jerusalem, August,		B.C. 560
Seventy years desolation of the city, ending in the fourth year of Darius, son of Hystaspes	August,	490
First Scriptural year of Darius, as king over the Chaldeans, when about sixty-two years old		493
Birth of Christ, at the end of 70 Sabbatical weeks, or 490 years, counted from the first year of Darius . . .	Dec.	3

The seventy years which immediately follow the capture of Jerusalem form one of the most perplexing periods in all chronology. This period embraces the time of the capture of the great city Babylon, as related by Daniel, Herodotus, Xenophon, and Berosus, concerning the time of which there is much variety of opinion. The questions arise during this period,—who was the Cyrus or

Coresh of Scripture?—who was Belshazzar?—who was Darius the Median?—and, above all, on the right adjustment of this period depends the explanation of the Weeks of Daniel.

The schemes of Josephus, Africanus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Eusebius, have failed to satisfy any one on these points, and have been set aside by the acuteness of Scaliger and his contemporaries. In their place has been set up a system, under many varieties, resting chiefly on the authority, as is supposed, of the great astronomer Ptolemy, in what is called the Canon of Ptolemy. Such portions of this Canon as rest upon eclipses recorded at Babylon, as having happened in certain years of the reign of certain kings of Babylon, can never be set aside. But where these eclipses fail us, we are left at liberty to doubt. The result, we know, is still unsatisfactory. Ancient authorities are still at variance with each other, and even more so with Scripture.

So much has the discrepancy between sacred and profane chronology been dwelt upon by doubting critics, that it has become the fashion of too many even to deny the authenticity of the book of Daniel, on the ground of the apparent ignorance of the writer of the order of events during the time when he declares himself to have been living. Even the cautious Rosenmüller, amidst a host of German critics, has charged the prophet with ignorantly confounding Cyaxares, king of Media, with Darius Hystaspes, king of Persia.* The ignorance, however, I doubt not, rests not with Daniel, but with the chronological scheme which involves so glaring a contra-

* *See* Hengstenberg's "Genuiness of Daniel," p. 40, trans.

diction. I have myself argued, in my "Chronology of the times of Daniel, Ezra, &c.," in favour of the identity of Cyaxares, of Media, with Darius the Median of Daniel. But I feel that the point is untenable. How is it that Berosus, who has recorded the succession of kings to the throne of Babylon to the time of Cyrus, and in so many points agrees with the account contained in Scripture, makes no mention of any such king as Cyaxares, or Darius, on that throne before Cyrus? though Daniel distinctly writes, "Darius, the Median took the kingdom!" Here, I say, there is an insuperable difficulty in our current arrangement of the chronology of this period—which disappears, however, when we adopt the dates recorded by the Jewish historian Demetrius.

In this state of perplexity, the most reasonable course seems to be to consult again the original records of those writers who may be considered most competent from their position, either as to time or place, to have acquainted themselves with the history of these seventy years.

Now Daniel, we are told, was living during the greater portion of these seventy years in Babylon. Ezra and Zechariah were both living within the period, and wrote immediately after. Ezra also had been at Babylon. Berosus was a priest of Babylon, and wrote within two hundred years after Daniel. These then are our natural sources of information concerning Babylonish affairs; and, where any contradiction arises, should be allowed to outweigh the authority of Greek travellers, however trustworthy, who frequently must have recorded merely hearsay evidence, put together according to the best of their judgement. What do these authorities record?

Zechariah vii. 1. 5, counts distinctly seventy years from the *destruction* of Jerusalem to the fourth year of Darius. For the fast of the fifth month, which was instituted in commemoration of the taking of that city in the fifth month, seems to have been kept till the fourth of that king's reign, and during the whole seventy years.

In the second year of the reign of Darius (Zech. 1. 12) we find the words, "How long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem"—"against which thou hast had *indignation* these threescore and ten years?" which period is correctly counted from the commencement of the siege of Jerusalem—that is to say, from two years before the capture. Now, seventy years counted either from the siege, or the capture of the city, must necessarily end somewhere in the reign of Darius Hystaspes, on any view of the chronology.

Ezra, in the 2 Chron. xxxvi. 20, 21, counts the same period of seventy years from the *burning of the temple* and and palaces "to the *reign* of the kingdom of Persia," indicating therefore that the reign of the Persians, in Babylon, did not commence till the time of Darius the son of Hystaspes.

Berosus, in a passage which I have not seen before referred to, quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. i., states that in "the twelfth (eleventh) year of Zedekiah, king of Judah, Nebuchodonosor made war upon the Jews and Phœnicians seventy years before the *reign of the Persians*"—προ τῆς Περσῶν ἡγεμονίας, which expression is nearly the same as that made use of by Ezra. And as Berosus elsewhere counts not quite sixty years from the nineteenth year of Nebuchodonosor to the end of the reign of Cyrus, he marks, in the passage quoted,

the commencement of the direct government of the Persians in Babylon as taking place in the course of the reign of Darius, son of Hystaspes. Babylon we know was conquered long before the time of Darius, and had become a province of the Persian empire. So had Judea become a province of Babylon in the reign of Jehoiakim, and a province of Rome in the time of Pompey. Yet the kings of Judah, in the one case, are counted to the reign of Zedekiah, and, in the other, to the reign of Herod or Agrippa. And so in Babylon, if we believe Ezra and Berosus, the sceptre did not pass out of the hands of Chaldean satraps, or governors, till the reign of Darius son of Hystaspes.

Now, is not this exactly what we are told by Daniel himself? who writes, "In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus (Darius, son of Hystaspes), of the seed of the Medes (as opposed to the seed of the Chaldeans), which was *made king over the realm of the Chaldeans;* in the first year of his reign I, Daniel, understood by books," &c.—"that he would accomplish *seventy years* in the *desolations* of Jerusalem," ix. 1, 2. Here again is the identical period of seventy years beginning from the *desolation* of Jerusalem, and drawing to a close in the first year of Darius. Is it not idle to tell us that this Darius was Cyaxares? His title in Babylon was Darius. Neither Berosus nor any other historian of Babylonish affairs makes mention of any king of that title having been made king over the realm of the Chaldeans, till the reign of Darius, son of Hystaspes. The same period, calculated from the same terminus *a quo*, can only bring us to the same terminus *ad quem*, viz., the reign of the Persian

Darius. And if any one objects that he was "of the seed of the Medes," and not of the Persians, he will find innumerable passages both in Herodotus and other writers, where the Persians are included under the term Medes, and where the subjects both of Cyrus and Darius himself are spoken of as Medes. It is a delusion then to suppose that the king called Darius by Daniel was Cyaxares. He could be no other than the king spoken of by Haggai and Zechariah, and that king was Darius, son of Hystaspes.

But again, if "Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes," is Darius the son of Hystaspes, who, we ask, is "Darius the Median," Daniel v. 30, who "took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old?" Clearly the same as he who was "made king over the realm of the Chaldeans," viz., Darius the son of Hystaspes, for no other king bearing that title reigned at Babylon before him. And here lies the explanation of the whole mystery and difficulty in this period of chronology. Darius Hystaspes did not take upon himself the government of the province of Babylon till he was about sixty-two years of age; that is to say, till towards the latter part of his life. And the first, second, and fourth years of his reign mentioned in Scripture, do not date from his accession to the throne of Persia, but from the sixty-second or sixty-third year of his age, when he took the government of the province of Babylon into his own hands. Scaliger and Petavius, and their followers, have detected the error of Africanus and Eusebius, who place the Scriptural first year of Cyrus in the year B.C. 560, when he is said to have come to the throne of Persia;

whereas it is clear that his Scriptural first year dates after his capture of Babylon. But they failed to observe that the same correction is necessary with regard to the Scriptural first year of Darius. In the second year of his reign, according to the computation of Scripture, we may infer that Darius was in person "there at Babylon," Ezra v. 17, and vi. 1, when the rulers of Samaria request that search may be made for the decree of Cyrus. And in his sixth year, according to the same computation, he is styled "king of Assyria," Ezra vi. 22. That the first year of Darius spoken of by Daniel was late in the reign of that king, may, independently of the fact that he was then sixty-two years of age, be inferred from Herodotus, who states that the empire of Persia was divided into twenty-two satrapies, so soon as Darius had established his power, and that such was the fact is confirmed by the rock inscription at Behistún. But when Daniel informs us, that it pleased Darius, when he took the kingdom, "to set over the kingdom a hundred and twenty princes, and over these three presidents," it is clear therefore that the form of government was entirely changed, and a system of centralization introduced which must have taken place after the trial of the system of satrapies. As this view of the question is new, and requires to be supported by more than mere conjecture, and as my communication has already extended to an unreasonable length, I propose in my next to try the truth of my position by the following stringent tests:—

1st. Was Darius, the son of Hystaspes, "about threescore and two years old" in the year B.C. 493?

2nd. Was that year, which was his first in Scripture,

about 70 weeks of years, or 490 years, before the birth of the Messiah, as we may infer from Daniel ix. 1—24?

3rd. Was that year Sabbatical, as must have been the case if it preceded 70 Sabbatical weeks?

4th. Was the second year of Darius, thus found, in which the Temple of Jerusalem was rebuilt, a year of Jubilee in accordance with Jewish tradition?

5th. Were the second and fourth years of Darius, thus fixed, exactly 70 years after the siege of Jerusalem (in B.C. 562), and the capture of Jerusalem (in B.C. 560), respectively, as we are informed by the prophet Zechariah?

I am, &c. J. W. BOSANQUET.

THE ECLIPSE OF THALES IDENTIFIED WITH THAT OF THE 28TH MAY, B.C. 585, BY MEANS OF THE ECLIPSE OF AGATHOCLES.

Astronomers are still undecided concerning the true date of the eclipse of Thales. All that has yet been accomplished by them upon this point, is to throw doubt (on insufficient grounds, I think,) on the historical date of that event, recorded by Pliny and others, viz. B.C. 585. Indeed, it may be said, that the position in which the question is at present left by astronomy, is that of doubt whether any one solar eclipse, which occurred within any conceivable limit for the time of the event, can be shewn to have fulfilled the requirements of the history in which it is related. These remarks are made with extreme deference to astronomical science, and only on the conviction that they are borne out by the observations of a very eminent astronomer, viz., Mr. Baily, in his able and elabo-

rate treatise on the eclipse of Thales, which may be referred to in the "Philosophical Transactions" of the year 1811, the last treatise, I believe, which has been written on the subject.

Mr. Baily, after computing, according to the best tables accessible in his day, the elements of every solar eclipse from the year B.C. 650 to B.C. 580, has set aside the several dates which had been previously assigned to the event, and has decided that no one eclipse was total within the limits of Asia Minor during that period of seventy years, excepting only the eclipse which took place on the 30th Sept. B.C. 610. He therefore concluded, as did also Herr Oltmann, the German astronomer, that the eclipse of B.C. 610 alone could be that which occurred during the battle between the Medes and Lydians, as related by Herodotus.

No sooner, however, had Mr. Baily arrived at this conclusion, than he proceeded to test the accuracy of his tables, by applying them to an eclipse which took place in August B,C. 310, in the reign of Agathocles: in which instance the true place of the moon's shadow was considered by him to be defined with sufficient accuracy in history. The result of this test was, to detect an inaccuracy in his tables, sufficient after correction and application again to the eclipse of B.C. 610, to throw the total shadow of that eclipse also beyond the limits of Asia Minor: thus leaving no single eclipse, within the above period of seventy years, according to his computation, applicable to the words of Herodotus.

Agathocles, king of Syracuse, as appears from Diodorus Siculus having conducted his fleet from that city, was

chased by the Carthaginian fleet till *about sunset*, on the day before the eclipse, *i. e.*, on the 14th of August B.C. 310. He was saved from destruction by the darkness of night, and on the following morning, between seven and eight o'clock as it appears, he became enveloped in the shadow of an eclipse, which was total, for it is said that the stars appeared in every direction and the day became like night. Mr. Baily concludes, I think correctly, that Agathocles at the moment was not more than about fifty miles from Syracuse. He observes also, from Diodorus, that after rowing day and night, Agathocles arrived on the coast of Africa on the *seventh day* after quitting Syracuse, and landed at a place "*called the quarries.*" Προς τὰς καλουμένας λατομίας. Mr. Baily proceeds :—

"Agathocles, therefore, probably landed near the Syrtis Minor, or Gulf of Cabes, about three hundred miles in a direct course from Syracuse, whence we may reasonably conclude that he performed one sixth of his passage, or about fifty miles, in the space of one day . . . . . Syracuse lies in N. lat. 37° 3′, and E. long. 15° 14′, and consequently on the day after the sailing of Agathocles from that port, being the day on which the eclipse took place, the fleet would be in about N. lat. 36¼°. At all events it could not from the direction of its course be much farther south than this point, which is all that is required in the present instance; and a few miles either way not being of any material consequence. It follows, therefore, that in the meridian of Syracuse, the northern part of the moon's umbra ought to extend as far north as that parallel of latitude; but, from the calculations above adduced, it will be found that the centre of the moon's shadow on

that meridian had only reached the parallel of about N. lat. $32\frac{1}{2}°$: and as the semi-diameter of the umbra was was not more than $47\frac{1}{2}$ English miles, or about two-thirds of a degree, the eclipse could not there be total to the northward of N. lat. $33\frac{1}{4}°$. Now, since the place where Agathocles landed in Africa was probably not situated below the parallel of N. lat. 34°, it is evident that he did not, in any part of his course, come within a considerable distance of the moon's umbra .... In order that the phenomena should accord with the fact as related by the historian, the centre of the moon's shadow ought to pass over, or very near to Malta, that is, *the latitude of the moon ought to be at least three degrees greater than our present tables make it.* Since the latitude of the moon depends on her true distance from the node, these observations (if correct) *will shew the necessity of some alteration in the table of the secular variation of the moon's mean distance from her node,* which (agreeably to the rule given by M. Laplace) is deduced immediately from the secular variation of her mean longitude ..... Such an alteration as is here suggested would somewhat vary the position of the route of the moon's umbra in all the eclipses which have been the subject of this paper; but in none of them would it alter the conclusions which have been drawn from them, except perhaps in the one Sept. 30, B.C. 610, which I have supposed to be that mentioned by Herodotus. In this particular case the path of the moon's umbra might, by such a correction, be thrown so much farther north *as to prevent the eclipse being total in any part of Asia Minor.* But it would remain the only one that can at all be adapted to the

account given by Herodotus: since there is no other that could possibly be central in or near Asia Minor from the year B.C. 650 to B.C. 580."

Now, though I would not venture to question any part of Mr. Baily's calculations, I may be allowed to point out an error in his statement of one of the most material facts of the case,—viz., the position of Agathocles, the correction of which will shew, that an increase in the latitude of the moon, beyond what was indicated by his tables, is required, not to the extent of three degrees only, as he infers, but more probably to the extent of five or six degrees,—the result of which, according to his own reasoning, will be decisive against the eclipse of September 30, B.C. 610.

Agathocles landed, as Diodorus relates, near a place "*called the quarries.*" These quarries were of sufficient importance in his days to give name to the spot, and are still of sufficient importance to be marked on our most recent maps. They are not, however, as Mr. Airy, the Astronomer Royal, has pointed out to me, in the Gulf of Cabes, but close to Cape Bon, and now called Alhowareah, or the "great quarries." The distance of this spot from Syracuse is not more than four days' voyage. Agathocles, therefore, did not proceed in a direct course towards the point of landing, but made a considerable deviation either north or south. We may infer from Justin that his direction was north: for Justin writes, "*nullo militum sciente quo veheretur*, cursum in Africam dirigit. *Cum* (that is, during their passage) omnes aut in *Italiam* prædatum se, aut in *Sardiniam* ituros crederent."—xii. 4. There is much significance in this word "*cum*," for if the

soldiers *during their course* supposed that they were proceeding to Italy or Sardinia, that course could not have been south. It is certain, therefore, if Justin is to be believed, that in order to avoid the superior fleet of the Carthaginians, Agathocles sailed *north* from Syracuse, and first taking the direction towards Italy, then towards Sardinia, a possession at that time of the Carthaginians, finally landed on the *seventh day* on the most northerly point of Africa. If so, instead of being on the morning of the day after the battle in lat. 36¼°, where Mr. Baily places him, he would have been about lat. 37¾°; and the centre of the moon's umbra, instead of falling upon Malta, must have passed somewhere between lat. N. 37¼° and 38½°,—that is to say, between five and six degrees above the latitude found by Mr. Baily's tables. If then (applying this correction to the eclipse of B.C. 610) three degrees of increased latitude would throw the line of total shadow of that eclipse out of Asia Minor, two or three degrees more would, without doubt, place it entirely out of the question.

Are we then left without any eclipse which will meet the words of Herodotus? I think not. The data furnished by Mr. Baily appear to me sufficient to re-establish the truth of the historical date. And, if I mistake not, the eclipse of 28th of May, B.C. 585, will yet prove to be a notable instance of the value and accuracy of historical tradition, the record of which in this case is, that the eclipse took place in the forty-eighth or forty-ninth Olympiad.

Let us then apply the correction of the moon's latitude, as above found, to this eclipse. Mr. Baily calculates that

"the centre of the moon's shadow proceeded to the parallel of N. lat. 40° in W. long. 13°, when turning to the southward, it crossed Spain, and traversed the course of the Mediterranean." And he adds, "by a trigonometrical calculation, I have ascertained that the sun set centrally eclipsed in N. lat. 20° 1′ and E. long. 35° 2′.

Now, without pretending to perfect accuracy, if we correct the latitude of the centre of the moon's umbra in B.C. 585 to the extent of six degrees, partly for the amount of error in position found in the eclipse of Agathocles, which happened at the same node, partly for an increase of error during nearly three centuries, from B.C. 310 to 585, it would have reached on the day in question the parallel of N. lat. 46°, W. long. 13°, and if we make a similar correction for the place of termination of the eclipse eastward at sunset, from N. lat. 28° 1′, E. long. 35° 2′, to N. lat. 34° 1′, E. long. 35° 2′, and draw a line between the two points, the centre of the moon's shadow will pass just north of the island of Samos, through *Ionia*, Lycia, and the island of Cyprus, and terminate in the sea, about seventy miles north of Sidon. And, as the semi-diameter of the total shadow in this instance was upwards of one degree, the eclipse would appear to have been total at Smyrna, Sardis the capital of Lydia, Perga in Pamphylia, and over the southern part of Cilicia. Would such a line of shadow coincide with the words of Herodotus?

Let us dismiss the idea that the battle took place near the Halys, for which there is no authority, and consider two slight indications of the locality which we find in the history. First, it is said that Thales foretold this

eclipse to the Ionians; from which we may infer that he expected that it would be visible in Ionia, and so it would appear to have been. Second,—immediately after the battle the king of Cilicia assisted in negotiating a treaty of peace; from which I would infer that the approach of the Medes towards Lydia was through Cilicia, which indeed is the most direct and obvious road. Cappadocia, which adjoins Cilicia, we know (Herod. i. 72), was subject at this time to the Medes. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to assume that the Medes, having forced their way through Cilicia, if not indeed in alliance with the king of that country, fought the battle with the Lydians somewhere between Cilicia and Lydia,—that is to say, directly under the line of shadow as above laid down.

Thus, both by computation and by history we appear to be led to the same point for this eclipse; and I humbly submit to the consideration of those who are more competent than I am to decide with accuracy such questions, whether the line I have marked out is not somewhere near the truth

This, however, I will affirm without fear of contradiction. That, admitting the foregoing data, the eclipse of B.C. 610 is absolutely excluded from the question. That nothing which has hitherto been advanced by astronomers has succeeded in displacing the historical eclipse of B.C. 585. And that if that eclipse be not the true one, there is no other which will meet the requirements both of history and astronomy.

J. W. BOSANQUET.

THE ECLIPSE OF THALES.

The recent improvements in the theory of the Moon, due to the elaborate investigations of the Astronomer Royal and Professor Hansen, have rendered a new calculation of the eclipse supposed to be identical with that predicted by Thales very desirable:—the corrections being so large that it is evident the results obtained by Mr. Baily and Professor Oltmann would be materially affected by them. This circumstance, added to the historical arguments against the hitherto received date advanced by Mr. Bosanquet in his interesting communications to your journal, have induced me to ascertain the effect of the modern corrections in the elements of the moon's orbit upon the path of the shadow during the eclipses B.C. 610, September 30, and B.C. 585, May 28. I have made use of Burckhardt's tables of the moon,—which are at present employed in the preparation of our Nautical Almanac. Instead, however, of adopting the tabular values, I have altered the secular movements of anomaly, mean longitude and node, so as to bring them in agreement with the numbers resulting from Mr. Airy's discussion of the Greenwich lunar observations: and it is worthy of remark, that the corrections indicated by Mr. Airy are almost identical with those derived from a re-calculation of the nineteen lunar eclipses recorded by Ptolemy in his Almagest, as regards the motion of the node and mean longitude. The secular equations involving terms depending on the squares and cubes of the times I have adopted as they result from the researches of Professor Hansen. Much depends on the numerical

values of the co-efficients in these equations when we have to calculate for an epoch twenty-four centuries anterior to the present, and very small variations in their absolute magnitudes will produce a considerable effect at so remote a period. I have not altered the other equations; their influence being small, as compared with the changes produced by the corrections just specified.

With Burckhardt's tables thus modified, and Carlini's last tables of the sun, I find, that the conjunction in right ascension would take place B.C. 610, September 30, at 7h. 54m. 50s. A.M mean time at Greenwich, in R.A. 179° 54′·8. The central and total eclipse would commence on the earth generally in longitude 4° 53′ W. and latitude 56° 37′ N. It would be central and total at noon in longitude 59° 34′ E. and latitude 40° 55′ N., and the middle of the eclipse at sunset would fall in longitude 134° 31′ E. and latitude 20° 14′ N. Hence, it is quite evident that the moon's shadow did not pass over any part of Asia Minor, but rather over the northern part of the Black Sea; and consequently, the eclipse was not total at or near the spot indicated by history as the position where the contest took place, nor was it visible in Ionia. The eclipse of September 30, B.C. 610 could not have been the one recorded by Herodotus and predicted by Thales.

It remains to examine how far the great eclipse of B.C. 585, May 28, will agree with historical facts. Employing the same tables, similarly corrected, I find, that the sun and moon were in conjunction in right ascension at 2h. 53m. 27s. P.M. Greenwich mean time, in 57° 21′·6. The central and total eclipse began upon the earth gene-

rally in longitude 115° 16′ W. and latitude 2° 6′ N.; it fell at noon in longitude 45° 39′ W. and latitude 41° 59′ N., and ended in longitude 32° 47′ E. and latitude 35° 51′ N., at which point the sun would set centrally and totally eclipsed. The following would also be positions in the central line:—

Longitude,	10°	43′ E.	Latitude,	43° 8′,	N.
„	14	35 E.	„	42 4	
„	20	58 E.	„	40 13	N.
„	24	45 E.	„	38 48	N.
„	27	39 E.	„	37 46	N.

The semi-diameter of the shadow towards the end of the eclipse would be 1° 10′, and consequently the zone of totality would be about 160 miles broad. Rome would be close upon its southern limit,—Athens clearly within the same,—so that the eclipse might be total there about one minute. The central line would pass a few miles north of Miletus, the reputed birthplace of Thales, and terminate in the sea to the north of the island of Cyprus. The eclipse would be total in Ionia, Lydia, Lycia, Pamphylia, and the southern part of Cilicia. All this agrees so well with historical indications, that I conceive we are justified in fixing upon the eclipse of B.C. 585, May 28, as that of Thales and Herodotus. No probable correction of the elements of the moon's orbit at a future period is likely to affect this conclusion. If the battle between the Medes and the Lydians took place somewhere about the position suggested by Mr. Bosanquet in the *Athenæum* of the 7th of August, it would fall within the limits of the total eclipse according to my calculation. The uncertainty which still attaches to some of the numbers involved in the computations for the eclipse requires, however, that we should regard the track of the shadow thus

laid down as an *approximation*, though a close one, to the truth,—admitting of a little variation one way or the other, though not to such an extent as to vitiate our inference in the present instance. If the eclipse were total and central *at* sunset in the position of the contending armies, the sudden transition from daylight to the darkness of night might well cause astonishment and terror; nay, it is questionable whether the effect would not be more imposing near sunset than at an earlier time of the day. It is quite certain that the totality could not have come on in any part of Asia Minor very long before the sun descended below the horizon,—because, as above stated, he set centrally and totally eclipsed at sea, north of the island of Cyprus. Those only who have witnessed the astounding effects of a total eclipse upon the appearance of nature can form an adequate idea of the phenomena likely to have presented themselves to the armies of Cyaxares and Alyattes on this occasion.

I have not calculated the eclipse of Agathocles; but as far as can be judged from the tendency of the modern improvements of the Lunar tables, as shewn in the years B.C. 585 and 610, there is strong reason to suppose that a new computation would fully reconcile Astronomy and History.

There is a misprint in Mr. Baily's paper on the Eclipse of Thales, where it is stated that a correction to the amount of three *degrees* in the moon's latitude would be required to represent the circumstances of the eclipse of Agathocles,—the alteration necessary is, about three *minutes*.

Mr. Bishop's Observatory, Aug. 24. J. R. HIND.

* Mr. Baily, I think, is speaking of terrestrial, not celestial latitude; of the latitude of the moon's umbra, not of the moon itself.—J. W. B.

BABYLONIAN CHRONOLOGY.

Claysmore, Enfield.

Pursuing the subject of my last communication, I now proceed to inquire—Was Darius, the son of Hystaspes, "about three score and two years old" in the year B C. 493?

That Darius was about that age in that year I propose to prove from the evidence of three most unexceptionable authorities:—First, Herodotus has told us that Darius reigned thirty-six years; and that this was, in some sense, the true length of his reign, is placed beyond doubt, by a monument still extant on the Cosseir road, in Egypt, on which the thirty-sixth year of Darius is recorded (Burton's Excerp. Hierog. xiv. 3). Secondly, Ctesias records that he died at the age of seventy-two—"ζήσας μὲν ἔτη οβ;" and, considering that Ctesias was physician to Artaxerxes Mnemon, and had peculiar opportunities of informing himself concerning Persian affairs, however much he may have erred in Assyrian history, and that seventy-two years is about the natural term of life of vigorous men, there is every reason to be satisfied with the correctness of his record in this particular. From the evidence of these authorities, therefore, we may assume that Darius reigned thirty-six years, and died at the age of 72.*

There is a third authority of great weight, from which we learn the actual dates of two particular years of the reign of Darius. Ptolemy, the astronomer, writing in the second century, mentions two eclipses, which had been

* Ctesias gives 31 years to Darius (the time he reigned supreme), and 18 years to Cambyses, together 49 years from B.C. 485. Cambyses, therefore, began to reign in B.C. 535, when, as we shall see, Darius was 20 years of age, as Herodotus affirms. Herodotus, I think, places the death of Smerdis three years too early.

observed and recorded at Babylon, during the reign of Darius. One occurred in the twentieth year of his reign, and fell on the 19th of November, B.C. 502; the other in the thirty-first year of his reign, and fell on the 25th of April, B.C. 491. From these data we may calculate with sufficient accuracy both the date of the year and the age of Darius in any year of his reign.

The years of his reign, according to Ptolemy, must have been computed from some point later than the 19th of November, and earlier than the 25th of April. They were counted probably from the commencement of the Persian civil year, as the Egyptians counted their reigns from the first month Thoth, and the Jews from their first month Nisan. The Persian civil year also probably began in spring, as we know was the case with the Jews, and as we shall presently see was the probable time from which the years of Darius were computed at Babylon.

The thirty-first year of Darius will thus have commenced about March or April, say March, B.C. 491, and will have ended about March, B.C. 490. His thirty-sixth and last year, therefore, will have ended about March, B.C. 485, in which year we know that Xerxes, his successor, came to the throne.

Darius died, then, in B.C. 485, having, according to Ctesias, either completed or entered upon his seventy-second year. Let us suppose him to have entered his seventy-second year during the summer of B.C. 485, and that he died in the autumn of that year. He would thus have completed his seventy-second year in the summer of B.C. 484, had he lived, and his sixty-second year would have terminated in the summer of B.C. 494,—and from

the summer of B.C. 494 to the summer of B.C. 493, in common parlance, he would have been called sixty-two years old, or as Daniel expresses it, "about three score and two years old."

There may be error, to the extent of not more than one year, in this computation, since Darius may, consistently with Ctesias, have died in his seventy-third year The conclusion, however, that he was about sixty-two years old during the first six months of the year B.C. 493 is quite consistent with the evidence.

At this age, we are told by Daniel, who was then at Babylon, that "Darius the Median took the kingdom." And since we know of no Darius who ruled over the Medes, and also at Babylon, before the son of Hystaspes, I have concluded that Daniel can only speak of that king. If so, Darius must have removed the seat of empire to Babylon, and have taken the government of that province into his own hands, in the year B.C. 493, three years before the battle of Marathon. There is nothing improbable in this; but, on the contrary, it is probable that Darius, in directing his preparations for revenging himself upon Greece, would desire to be nearer to the seat of action than the distant capital of Persia. He was at that time, we suppose, made "king over the realm of the Chaldeans," as it is elsewhere written,—in place of one of those native governors, or kings, through whom it had been the accustomed policy of the "great king" to rule the several dependent provinces; and in the second year of his so taking the throne of the Chaldeans, perhaps we may collect from the book of Ezra, v. 17, that he was actually in the great city "there at Babylon." He was

then certainly styled "king of Assyria," vi. 22, which is remarkable.

That it was during the first six months of the year B.C. 493, that is to say, in the spring of that year, that he took the kingdom of Babylon, we may infer from the books of Haggai and Zechariah, who mention in succession the first day of the sixth (Jewish) month, the seventh, eighth, ninth, and "four and twentieth day of the eleventh month, which is the month Sebat," in the second year of Darius. The years of the reign of Darius are counted, therefore, from after the twenty-fourth of Sebat, which falls in February, and from before the first day of the sixth Jewish month, which falls in August,—probably, therefore, from the commencement of the year, in the spring of B.C. 493. And this brings me to the second head of inquiry—Was that year, B.C. 493, which was his first in Scripture, about 70 weeks of years, or 490 years before the birth of the Messiah, as we may infer from Daniel, ix. 1—24?

This inquiry, lest I should trespass too much on your columns, I will defer to some future opportunity: adding, however, two observations, explanatory of my last communication;—viz., first, that there is no necessary connexion between the death of Belshazzar, Daniel, v. 30, and the accession of Darius the Median to the throne, v. 31; as has been before observed by Mr. Greswell,—verse 31 more properly belonging to the next chapter. Second, that the words in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, which appear to qualify the plain meaning of verses 19, 20, 21, viz., that Ezra counted seventy years from the burning of the Temple to the reign of the kingdom of Persia, were not

necessarily placed by Ezra where we now find them in Chronicles. They are a copy, word for word, from the beginning of the book of Ezra, where they properly belong, which book gives an account of how the decree of Cyrus led to the rebuilding of the Temple and the city in the reign of Darius, the son of Hystaspes.

I am, &c. I. W. BOSANQUET.

THE END.

LONDON: T. E. METCALF, PRINTER, 63, SNOW HILL.

SACRED AND PROFANE CHRONOLOGY,

ADJUSTED TO THE

SABBATIC PERIOD.

B.C.		Kings of Judah.	Sabbatical Weeks.
	993	1 Solomon	
	2	2	
	1	3	
Sab.	990	4	Solomon begins to build the Temple, 4th year, 2nd month, 2nd day. 2 Chron. iii. 2.
	9	5	
	8	6	
	7	7	
	6	8	
	5	9	
	4	10	
Sab.	3	11	Temple finished 11th yr 8th mo., 1 Kings, vi. 30.
	2	12	Temple dedicated in the 7th month, in the following year, 2 Chronicles, vii. 10.
	1	13	
	980	14	
	9	15	
	8	16	
	7	17	
1st Sab.	6	18	1st week after the dedication.
	5	19	
	4	20,	
	3	21	
	2	22	
	1	23	
	970	24	
2nd Sab.	9	25	2nd week
	8	26	
	7	27	
	6	28	
	5	29	
	4	30	
	3	31	
3rd Sab.	2	32	3rd week
	1	33	
	960	34	
	9	35	
	8	36	
	7	37	
	6	38	
4th Sab.	5	39	4th week
	4	40	
	3	1 Rehoboam	
	2	2	
	1	3	Jeroboam causes Israel to sin 390 years before the siege of Jerusalem, B.C. 562=B.C. 952, Ezekiel iv. 5.

B.C.		Kings of Judah.	Sabbatical Weeks.
	950	4 Rehoboam	
	9	5	
5th Sab.	8	6	5th week
	7	7	
	6	8	
	5	9	
	4	10	
	3	11	
	2	12	
	1	13	
6th Sab	940	14	6th week
	9	15	
	8	16	
	7	17	
	6	1 Abijah	
	5	2	
7th Sab.	4	3	7th week, followed by a Jubilee
	3	1 Asa	
1st Jubilee	2	2	
	1	3	
	930	4	
	9	5	
	8	6	
1st Sab.	7	7	8th week
	6	8	
	5	9	
	4	10	
	3	11	
	2	12	
	1	13	
2nd Sab.	920	14	9th week. Covenant renewed in the 15th year, 3rd month ii. Chron. xv. 10.
	9	15	
	8	16	
	7	17	
	6	18	
	5	19	
	4	20	
3rd Sab.	3	21	10th week
	2	22	
	1	23	
	910	24	
	9	25	
	8	26	
	7	27	
4th Sab.	6	28	11th week
	5	29	
	4	30	
	3	31	
	2	32	
	1	33	

B.C.		Kings of Judah.	Sabbatical Weeks.
	900	34 Asa	
5th Sab.	9	35	12th week
	8	36	
	7	37	
	6	38	
	5	39	
	4	40	
	3	41	
6th Sab.	2	1 Jehosophat	13th week
	1	2	
	890	3	
	9	4	
	8	5	
	7	6	
	6	7	
7th Sab.	5	8	14th week followed by a Jubilee
	4	9	
Jubilee			
	3	10	
	2	11	
	1	12	
	880	13	
	9	14	
1st Sab.	8	15	15th week
	7	16	
	6	17	
	5	18	
	4	19	
	3	20	
	2	21	
	1	22	16th week
2nd Sab.	870	23	
	9	24	
	8	25	
	7	1 Jehoram	
	6	2	
	5	3	
3rd Sab.	4	4	17th week
	3	5	
	2	6	
	1	7	
	860	8	
	9	1 Ahaziah	
	8	1 Athaliah	
4th Sab.	7	2	18th week
	6	3	
	5	4	
	4	5	
	3	6	
	2	1 Joash.	
	1	2	

B.C.	Kings of Judah.	Sabbatical Weeks.
5th Sab. 850	3	19th week
9	4	
8	5	
7	6	
6	7	
5	8	
4	9	
6th Sab. 3	10	20th week
2	11	
1	12	
840	13	
9	14	
8	15	
7	16	
7th Sab. 6	17	21st week followed by a Jubilee
5	18	
Jubilee 4	19	
3	20	
2	21	
1	22	
830	23	
1st Sab. 9	24	22nd week
8	25	
7	26	
6	27	
5	28	
4	29	
3	30	
2nd Sab. 2	31	23rd week
1	32	
820	33	
9	34	
8	35	
7	36	
6	37	
3rd Sab. 5	38	24th week
4	39	
3	40	
2	1 Amaziah	
1	2	
810	3	
9	4	
4th Sab. 8	5	25th week
7	6	
6	7	
5	8	
4	9	
3	10	
2	11	
1	12	
5th Sab. 800		26th week

B.C.	Kings of Judah,	Sabbatical Weeks.
800	13 Amaziah	
9	14	
8	15	
7	16	
6	17	
5	18	
6th Sab. 4	19	27th week
6th Sab. 3	20	
2	21	
1	22	
790	23	
9	24	
8	25	
7th Sab. 7	26	28th week followed by
7th Sab. 6	27	a Jubilee
Jubilee 5	28	
4	29	
3	1 Uzziah	
2	2	
1	3	
1st Sab. 780	4	29th week
1st Sab. 9	5	
8	6	
7	7	
6	8	
5	9	
4	10	
2nd Sab. 3	11	30th week
2nd Sab. 2	12	
1	13	
770	14	
9	15	
8	16	
7	17	
3rd Sab. 6	18	31st week
3rd Sab. 5	19	
4	20	
3	21	
2	22	
1	23	
760	24	
4th Sab. 9	25	32nd week
4th Sab. 8	26	
7	27	
6	28	
5	29	
4	30	
3	31	
5th Sab. 2	32	33rd week
5th Sab. 1	33	

Weeks of Years.	B.C.	Judæa.	Samaria.	Babylon.	Assyria.
	750	34 Uzziah			1 Pul
	9	35			2
	8	36			3
	7	37		1 Nabonassar	4
	6	38		2	5
	5	39		3	6
34	6th Sab. 4	40	Menahem 1	4	7
	3	41	2	5	8
	2	42	3	6	9
	1	43	4	7	10
	740	44	5	8	11
	9	45	6	9	12
35	7th Sab. 8	46	7	10	13
	Jubilee 7	47	8	11	14
	6	48	9	12	15
	5	49	10	13	16
	4	50	Pekahiah 1	14	1 Tiglath Pileser
	3	51	2	1 Nadius	2
	2	52	Pekah 1	2	3
	1	1 Jotham	2	1 Chinzerus	4
36	1st Sab. 730	2	3	2 and	5
	9	3	4	3 Porus	6
	8	4	5	4	7
	7	5	6	5	8
	6	6	7	1 Ilulæus	9
	5	7	8	2	10
	4	8	9	3	11
37	2nd Sab. 3	9	10	4	12
	2	10	11	5	13
	1	11	12	1 Mardocempadus	14 1 Sargon
	720	12	13	2	15 2
	9	13	14	3	16 3
	8	14	15	4	17 4
	7	15	16	5	18 5
38	3rd Sab. 6	1 Ahaz	17	6	19 6
	5	2	18	7	20 7
	4	3	19	8	21 8
	3	4	20	9	22 9
	2	5	21	10	23 10
	1	6	22	11	24 11
	710	7	23	12	25 12
39	4th Sab. 9	8	24	1 Arcianus	26
	8	9	25	2	27
	7	10	26	3	1 Shalmanezer
	6	11	27	4	2
	5	12	28	5	3
	4	13	Hosea 1	Interregnum	4
	3	14	2		5
40	5th Sab. 2	15	3	1 Belibus	6
	1	1 Hezekiah	4	2	7

Weeks of Years.	B.C.	Judæa.	Samaria.	Babylon.	Assyria.	Media.	Persia.	Egypt.	Lydia.	Tyre.
	709	2 Hezekiah 5		3 Belibus	8 Shalmanezer				5 Gyges	27 Ithlæus
	9	3 Hosea 6		1 Apronadius	9				6	28
	8	4	7	2	10				7	29
	7	5	8	3	11				8	30
	6	6	9	4	12				9	31
41	6th Sab. 5	7		5	13				10	32
	4	8		6	14				11	33
	3	9		1 Regibelus	15				12	34
	2	10		1 Mesessi Mordach	16				13	35
	1	11		2	1 Sennacherib				15	36
	690	12		3	2				15	
	9	13		4	3	1 Deioces			16	
42	7th Sab. 8	14		Interregnum	4	2 "		1 Tarcos	17	
	Jubilee 7	15			5	3		2 or	18	
	6	16			6	4		3 Tirhakah	10	
	5	17		Hagisa	7	5		4 king of	20	
	4	18		Merodach Baladan	8	6		5 Ethiopia	21	
	3	19		1 Elibus	9	7		6	22	
	2	20		2	10	8		7	23	
43	1st Sab. 1	21		3	11	9		8	24	
	680	22		1 Asaradinus	12	10		9	25	
	9	23		2	13	11		10	26	
	8	24		3	14	12		11	27	
	7	25		4	15	13		12	28	
	6	26		5	16	14		13	29	
44	2nd Sab. 5	27		6	17	15		14	30	
	4	28		7	1 Esarhaddon	16		15	31	
	3	29		8	2	17		16	32	
	2			9	3	18		17	33	
	1	1 Manasseh		10	4	19		18	34	
	670	2		11	5	20		1 Stephinates	35	
	9	3		12	6	21		2	36	
	8	4		13	7	22		3	37	
45	3rd Sab. 7	5		1 Saosduchinus	1 Adrameles	23		4	38	
	6	6		2	2	24		5	1 Ardys	
	5	7		3	3	25		6	2	
	4	8		4	4	26		7	3	
	3	9		5	5	27		1 Nechepsos	4	
	2	10		6	6	28		2	5	
	1	11		7	7	29		3	6	
46	4th Sab. 660	12		8	8	30		4	7	
	9	13		9	9	31		5	8	
	8	14		10	10	32		6	9	
	7	15		11	11	33		1 Necho I.	10	
	6	16		12	12	34		2	11	
	5	17		13	13	35		3	12	
47	5th Sab. 4	18		14	14	36		4	13	
	3	19		15	15	37		5	14	
	2	20		16	16	38		6	15	
	1	21		17	17	39		7	16	

Weeks of Years.	B.C.	Judea		Babylon.		Assyria		Media.		Persia.	Egypt.		Lydia.		Tyre.
	650	22	Manasseh	18	Saosduchinus	18	Adrazameles	40	Deioces		8	Necho I.	17	Ardys	
	9	23		19		19		41			1	Psammeticus	18		
	8	24		20		20		42			2		19		
	7	25		1	Kiniladinus	21		43			3		20		
48	6	26	6th Sab.	2		1	Axerdis	44			4		21		
	5	27		3		2		45			5		22		
	4	28		4		3		46			6		23		
	3	29		5		4		47			7		24		
	2	30		6		5		48			8		35		
	1	31		7		6		49			9		26		
49	640	32	7th Sab.	8		7		50			10		27		
	9	33	Jubilee	9		8		51			11		28		
	8	34		10		9		52			12		29		
	7	35		11		10		53			13		30		
	6	36		12		11		54			14		31		
	5	37		13		12		1	Phraortes		15		32		
	4	38		14		13		2			16		33		
50	3	39	1st Sab.	15		14		3			17		34		
	2	40		16		15		4			18		35		
	1	41		17		16		5			19		36		
	630	42		18		17		6			20		37		
	9	43		19		18		7			21		38		
	8	44		20		19		8			22		39		
	7	45		21		20		9			23		40		
51	6	46	2nd Sab.	22		21		10			24		41		
	5	47		1	Nabopalassar	1	Nabopalassar	11			25		42		
	4	48		2		2	or	12			26		43		
	3	49		3		3	Sardanapalus	13			27		44		
	2	50		4		4		14			28		45		
	1	51		5		5		15			29		46		
	620	52		6		6		16			30		47		
52	9	53	3rd Sab.	7		7		17			31		48		
	8	54		8		8		18			32		49		
	7	55		9		9		19			33		1	Sadyattes	
	6	1	Amon	10		10		20			34		2		
	5	2		11		11		21			35		3		
	4	1	Josiah	12		12		22			33		4		
	3	2		13		13		1	Cyaxares		37		5		
53	2	3	4th Sab.	14		14		2			38		6		
	1	4		15		15		3			39		7		
	610	5		16		16		4			40		8		
	9	6		17		17		5			41		9		
	8	7		18		18		6			42		10		
	7	8		19		19		7			43		11		
	6	9		20		20	1	8			44		12		
54	5	10	5th Sab.	21			2	9			45		1	Alyattes	
	4	11					3	10			46		2		
	3	12					4	11			47		3		
	2	13					5	12			48		4		
	1	14					6	13			49		5		

Scythians reign in Babylon.

Scythians reign at Nineveh

Weeks of Years.	B.C.	Judea.	Babylon.	Assyria.	Media.	Persia.	Egypt.	Lydia.	Tyre.
	600	15 Josiah			14 Cyaxares		50 Psammeticus	6 Alyattes	
	9	16			15		51	7	
	8	17			16		52	8	
55	6th Sab. 7	18			17		53	9	
	6	19			18		54	10	
	5	20			19		1 Necho. II.	11	
	4	21			20		2	12	
	3	22			21		3	13	
	2	23			22		4	14	
	1	24			23		5	15	
56	7th Sab. 590	25			24		6	16	
	Jubilee 9	26			25		7	17	
	8	27			26		8	18	
	7	28			27		9	19	
	6	29			28		10	20	
	5	30			29		11	21	
57	1st Sab. 4	31			30		12	22	
	3	Jehohahaz			31		13	23	
	2	1 Jehoiakim			32		14	24	
	1	2			33		15	25	
	580	3			34		16	26	
	9	4			35		1 Psammuthes	27	
	8	5	1 Nabokolassar		36		2	28	
	7	6	or		37		3	29	
58	2nd Sab. 6	7	3 Nebuchadnezzar		38		4	30	
	5	8	4		39		5	31	
	4	9	5		40		6	32	
	3	10	6		1 Astyages		1 Vaphres	33	
	2	11	7		2		2 or	34	1
	1	Jechoniah	8		3		3 Hopra	35	2
59	3rd Sab. 570	1 Zedekiah	9		4		4	36	3 siege of Tyre
	9	2	10		5		5	37	4 lasted 13 years
	8	3	11		6		6	38	5 in the reign
	7	4	12		7		7	39	6 of Ithobal.
	6	5	13		8		8	40	7
	5	6	14		9		9	41	8
	4	7	15		10		10 Amosis 1	42	9
60	3	8	16		11		11 2	43	10
	2	9	17		12		12 3	44	11
	1	10	18		13		13 4	45	12
	560	11	19		14		14 6	46	13
	9	2	20		15	Cyrus 1st 1	15 6	47	1 Baal
	8	3	21		16	2	16 7	48	2
	7	4	22		17	3	17 8	49	3
61	5th Sab. 6	5	23		18	4	18 9	50	4
	5	6	24		19	5	19 1 Amosis 10	51	5
	4	7	25		20	6	2 11	52	6
	3	8	26		21	7	3 12	53	7
	2	9	27		22	8	4 13	54	8
	1	10	28		23	9	5 14	55	9

70 years counted from the 4th year of Jehoiakim ending in the year with the destruction of Babylon

B.C. 508

70 years desolation of Jerusalem.

The Scythians reign for 28 years over Asia. Herodotus, L. i. 106.

Nineveh destroyed

Weeks of Years.	B.C.	Judæa.	Babylon.	Media.	Persia.	Egypt.	Lydia.	Tyre.
	550		29 Nabokolassar	24 Astyages	Cyrus 1st 10	6 Amosis 15	56 Alyattes	10 Baal 35
	9		30 or	25	11	7 16	57	Eimbalus 2
62	6th Sab. 8		31 Nebuchadnezzar	26	12	8 17	1 Crœsus	Chelbes 10
	7		32	27	13	9 18	2	Abbar 3
	6		33	28	14	10 19	3	1 Mytgonus
	5		34	29	15	11 20	4	2 and
	4		35	30	16	12 21	5	3 Gerastratus
	3		36	31	17	13 22	6	4
63	7th Sab. 2		37	32	18	14 23	7	5
	1		38	33	19	15 24	8	6
	Jubilee 540		39	24	20	16 25	9	1 Belatorus
	9		40	35	21	17 26	10	1 Merabalus
	8		41	1 Cyaxares	22	18 27	11	2
	7		42	2	23	19 28	12	3
	6		43	3	24	20 29	13	4
64	1st Sab. 5		1 Evilmerodach	4 Cambyses 1	1 Cambyses 25	21 30	14	1 Hiram
	4		2	5	2 2 vicroy 26	22 31		2
	3		1 Neriglissor	6	3 3 27	23 32		3
	2		2	7	4 4 28	24 33		4
	1		3	8	5 5 29	25 34		5
	530		4	9	6 6 30	26 35		6
	9		1 Laborosoarchod	10	7 7 Cambyses 1	27 36		7
65	2nd Sab. 8		2 Nabonidus	11	8 8 king 2	28 37		8
	7		3	12	9 9 3	29 38		9
	6		4	13	10 10 4	30 39		10
	5		5	14	11 11 5	31 40		11
	4		6	15	12 12 6	32 41		12
	3		7	1 Cyrus 2nd.	13 13 7	33 42		13
	2				14 14 8	34 43		14 = 1st Cyrus
	1		Darius 1		15 15 Darius 1	35 44		
66	3rd Sab. 520		vicroy 2		16 vicroy 2	1 Cambyses		
	9		3		17 3	2		
	8		4		18 4	3		
	7		5	Smerdis*	5			
	6		6	1 Darius	6	1 Darius		
	5		7	2 king	7 2 king			
	4		8	3	8 3			
67	4th Sab. 3		9	4	9 4			
	2		10	5	10 5			
	1		11	6	11 6			
	510		12	7	12 7			
	9		13	8	13 8			
	8		Babylon destroyed	14 9	14 9			
68	5th Sab. 7		186 years before the	15 10	15 10			
	6		death of Alexander	16 11	16 11			
	5		Clemens. Alex.	17 12	17 12			
	4		Strom. i.	18 13	18 13			
	3		Orosius. l. ii. c. 2.	19 14	19 14			
	2			20 15	20 15			
	1			21 16	21 16			

70 years from 4th of Jehoiakim to capture of Babylon in B.C. 508.

70 years desolation of Jerusalem from B.C. 562 to B.C. 502.

* Clemens Alexandrinus gives nineteen years to Cambyses and twenty-six to Xerxes.

Weeks of Years.	from the dedication	from the 1st of Darius	B.C.	Judea.	Babylon.	Media.	Persia.	
69			6th Sab. 500	70 years of Desolation of Jerusalem.	Darius 22	17 Darius		
			9		23	18		
			8		24	19		
			7		25	20		
			6		26	21		
			5		27	22		
			4		28	23		
70			7th Sab. 3		1 Darius transfers 29	24	1 Xerxes	Darius and Xerxes divide the empire, Darius
			2		2 the seat of govern- 30	25	2 or	being 62 years old.
			Jubilee 1		3 ment to Babylon, 31	26	3 Ahasuerus	
			490		4 at 62 yrs. old. 32	27	4 viceroy	
			9		5 33	28	5	
			8	Temple finished	6 34	29	6	
			7		7 35	30	7	
	1		6	and dedicated.	8 36	31	8	
			5		Xerxes 1	1 Xerxes	9	
			4		2	2 king	10	
			3		3	3	11	
			2		4	4	12	
			1		5	5	13	
			480		6	6	14	
1.	2		1st Sab. 9		7	7	15	Ezra comes to Jerusalem in the 7th of Xerxes,
			7		8	8	16	and restores the rites and ceremonies and the
			8		9	9	17	Sabbatical years.
			6		10	10	18	
			5		11	11	19	
			4		12	12	20	
			3		13	13	21	
2.	3		2nd Sab. 2		14	1 Artaxerxes	22	
			1		15	2 Longimanus	23	Themistocles writes to Artaxerxes Longimanus
			470		16	3 viceroy	24	
			9		17	4	25	
			8		18	5	26	
			7		19	6	Interregnum	
			6		20	7		
3	4		3rd Sab. 5		21	8	Artabanus	
			4			9 king	1 Artaxerxes	
			3			10	2 Longimanus	
			2			11	3 alone	
			1			12	4	
			460			13	5	
			9			14	6	
4.	5		4th Sab. 8			15	7	
			7			16	8	
			6			17	9	
			5			18	10	
			4			19	11	
			3			20	12	
			2			21	13	
5.	6		5th Sab. 1			22	14	

Weeks of Years.		B. C.		Judæa.	Persia.
5.	6	5th Sab.	450		15 Artaxerxes
			9		16 Longimanus
			8		17
			7		18
			6		19
			5		20
6.	7	6th Sab.	4		21
			3		22
			2		23
			1		24
			440		25
			9		26
			8		27
7.	8	7th Sab.	7	Wall of Jerusalem	28
			6	completed	29
		Jubilee	5	and dedicated.	

00142002

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 26 March, 2016